This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

4424.3

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER FVNDATA MDCCCVII
Ps. CXIX. 169.
כדברך תביכני
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος σος αληθεια ἐστι
ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙ
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ

THE

MOSAIC COSMOGONY.

A LITERAL TRANSLATION

OF THE

FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS,

WITH ANNOTATIONS AND RATIONALIA.

BY

ROBERT GEORGE SUCKLING BROWNE, B.D.,

FORMERLY OF CAIUS' AND OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGES, CAMBRIDGE;
FELLOW, TWICE ELECTED, OF DULWICH COLLEGE,
AND VICAR OF ATWICK, YORKSHIRE.

LONDON:
JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,
AND NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCCLXIV.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS AND SON,
ALDERSGATE STREET.

R. S. Nov. 15, 1872.

THIS ATTEMPT

TO TURN THE ENTIRE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

ON THE PATH OF SCIENCE

IS INSCRIBED

TO THE PRESIDENT, THE COUNCIL AND THE FELLOWS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY

BY

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THE little book which you hold in your hand, courteous reader, is designed to obviate and clear away difficulties by affording a correct view of the Mosaic account of the Creation. The religious and intellectual world is not, that I am aware, in possession of accurate Scriptural authority, upon which to proceed to any precise decision upon important and interesting subjects. Men of science are constantly at a loss to determine what they may and what they may not accept, as Divine communication. They are frequently brought up on a sharp curb in their excursions in the pursuit of knowledge. If this had been the design of the Author of all things and the Creator of man, the creature would have had the sole and simple duty of a meek submission. But since that benign Being has vouchsafed clear and bright disclosures, and the obscurity, that has supervened and made those disclosures unintelligible, is the result of the creature's ignorance and presumption, it can be no excess of duty if human efforts be made to dissipate that darkness, which human frailty has created.

The labour of dispersing these clouds, hanging over and obscuring Divine revelation, is not inconsiderable. Light will not always be found, how diligently soever it may be

sought, in the mysteries of criticism, or the caprices of interpretation. It is latent in regions, too little trodden and too little known. The explorers of that *terra incognita* return laden with wealth, that exposes them to the amazed incredulity of indolence. This *terra incognita* is not the page of the Word of God, as it is one while fairly, another while faintly, and not unfrequently falsely rendered in human translations; but that Word of God, which breathes the very tones and accents, in which the inspired Servant of the Most High wrote it under the dictation of the Holy Spirit. These sonorous tones and these living accents, or their equivalents, it has been my labour of reverential love to awaken and to vindicate and to transfer to these pages.

The geologist will exclaim impatiently at my presumption in tracing a sketch of a theory, that suits my views of the Mosaic Cosmogony. I have observed that, with those views, this planet may have undergone various and repeated disruptions; no limit to the number, or kinds, being possible. Its ignifluous state at some period is evident. That state may have been recurrent. But there must have been, subsequently to the last recurrence of an ignifluous state, some less terrific, some modified, some explosive, disruption. By this disruption, whenever it happened, the azoic bed was broken up and inequalities on the earth's surface produced. Was it not by this last disruption, or by a series of similar disruptions, creating these inequalities, that the beds were formed for receiving "into their several places" the superincumbent waters? If so, this last disruption, or series of disruptions, was the pro-

cess adopted by the Creator to restore to habitable order the Tohu and Bohu, that exceeding desolation, which prevailed up to, or at, that time. With deference I tender these hypotheses. With a similar feeling I invite Chemistry and Astronomy to aid me in the elucidation of my sacred subject. Such strength as I possess lies not in these interesting departments of knowledge.

Whatever may be the award of Science upon these matters, I must insist most solemnly and emphatically, that no theory can be true, or acceptable, which does not respect Divine Revelation. And that Divine Revelation, given by the aid of human language, I have laboured to place, and feel assured I have placed, in its true light. Not only is there no theory of an *ex nihilo* creation propounded by the inspired Prophet, but the notion is untenable, that Moses, in the two opening versicles, intended a Creation, indefinitely before the reconstruction of the earth, introductory to the *ex humo* creation of man. "There shall be light," was not the primal behest of Omnipotence in this stage of the earth's existence. "In the beginning," here intended, GOD renovated, that is, He *prepared and made habitable* the earth and its atmosphere. Nor, furthermore, was the creative power exerted, nor is it represented as having been at that period exerted, in creating the sources, or places, of light: the sun, the moon and the stars. Their previous existence is as surely asserted, as is the previous existence of the earth. The Expanse is the atmosphere, in which the bird of wing flies and the fertilizing clouds are suspended. This vast laboratory, in which nature operates immense analyses, solutions, precipitations and combina-

tions; this grand receiver, in which all the attenuated and volatilized productions of terrestrial bodies are received, mingled, agitated, combined and separated, is denominated "*the heavens.*" But the "heavenly bodies" move not in those "heavens," although through them this planet enjoys their brilliancy.

The independence of thought, I have asserted, is not incompatible with a profound respect for the opinions of others. It is the conviction that many of those opinions are grounded upon difficulties, thrown in the way of searchers after truth by translators and commentators, that emboldens me to demand a hearing and expect forbearance. Vociferous and startled prejudice has my fullest permission to envelope me in its vapour. Its volume will not shock me. My object is the vindication of the sacred Word of the GOD of Truth. The septuagenary has no dread of human censure; no thirst for human applause. In patience he awaits that good time, when he may be humbly hopeful, that his strenuous and fearless efforts in the highest and most holy cause, that can engage the mind of man, may receive the, "Well done!" of his SAVIOUR and his GOD.

THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY.

A LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE COSMOGONIC PORTION OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS, BY MOSES, OR COMPILED FROM ANCIENT RECORDS, UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT.

GENESIS I.

1. In the beginning GOD restored[1] to order the heavens and the earth.
2. Seeing that the earth had been and was in existence, an exceeding desolation: and darkness (*was*) on the face of the deep; and the SPIRIT of GOD brooded on the face of the waters.

WE obtain here the introductory statement. We behold what this globe and its surrounding atmosphere were, before a single act of renovation, or reconstruction, had taken place. How this planet and its component parts were reduced to a state of Tohu and Bohu, we are not enlightened. Whether it proceeded from Plutonic, or Neptunian confusion, or both, we are not forbidden, but rather solicited,

[1] We have here an instance of the logical concordance between the subject and the predicate. The subject, אֱלֹהִים, being in the plural number, the predicate would formally be in the plural number also; but as GOD, not gods, is intended, the predicate is put in concordance with the intended subject. Of similar construction is "נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי," GOD saith.—See Lee's Hebrew Grammar, Art. 216.

to investigate; if investigation may aid the pursuit of science and elevate our knowledge, and if our progress in science, and our increase of knowledge refine and deepen our faith. Tohu and Bohu,[1] utter desolation, it was, when the SPIRIT of GOD, whether in meditation or in efficacious influence, we are not told, sate like a bird on her eggs, and "brooded on the face of the waters."

"In the beginning." What is the scope of this phrase, "in the," rather a, "beginning?" Is this "beginning," that ascertained and definite, that unvaried and discernible, point of time, which we are wont to assign to those magic words? Is this beginning the actual conjuncture in which, as to this globe, non-existence and existence met? Verily and emphatically, it is not. A very little consideration will show that "*the beginning*," theologically viewed, is a

[1] Few attempts at a translation could be less felicitous, than that of Tohu and Bohu, by the Seventy: "ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος." This has been rendered by the author of "Creation in Plan and in Progress," literally. "Now the earth was invisible and unfurnished." Another learned translator, the Dean of Lichfield, has rendered this passage, "The earth moreover was viewless and unfashioned." What the Seventy had in view in their translation, or, rather, their perversion, of the sacred original, I am at a loss to conjecture. It was not for lack of better understanding, for in Jeremiah iv. 23, they have well and truly rendered the same terms Tohu and Bohu, "οὐθέν," nought; a concise representation of the actual state of the earth at the time. The "ἀργὸν καὶ ἀδιάκριτον," of Symmachus, is preferable to the Septuagint version; and Theodotion's "κενὸν καὶ οὐθέν," is very good. The "κένωμα καὶ οὐθέν," of Aquila, is scarcely so good; the former term has a germ of the theory of La Place. For these versions I am indebted to the Dean of Lichfield's Notes *ad locum*, not having access to the books themselves. I am further in the learned Dean's debt, for the following suggestions. "They," the LXX, I suppose, "may have called it ἀόρατος, because there was no human spectator, or because it was on all sides surrounded by the primeval waters; so Theodoret, Qu. 5 in Gen." The reader will see a still more strange translation of Tohu and Bohu, by the LXX, in Isa. xxxiv. 11; the Latin Vulgate is nearer to correctness; the English version is correct. The Dean of Lichfield's work is, The Book of Genesis, according to the Version of the LXX. Cambridge, Macmillan and Co. 1855.

shifting and dissolving phrase of Holy Scripture; that is, it is a phrase susceptible of various modifications. "In the beginning was The Word." (S. John i. 1.) How many ages, an absolute complement of eternity, before "the beginning," recorded by Moses! "From the beginning it was not so," (S. Mat. xix. 8,) are the words of The Word of GOD, manifest in the flesh, and they point to a time after the creation, or ex-humo formation, of man. I must be permitted to insist a while on this matter, that, "in the beginning," as applicable to human and mundane affairs in Holy Scripture, has no stereotyped, or settled meaning; its signification is by the context alone determinable. Any good Hebrew Lexicon will supply the various meanings of the Hebrew word רֵאשִׁית, rēshith. We read this word in 1 Sam. ii. 29, "*the chiefest* of all the offerings of Israel:" in Jer. xlix. 35, "*the chief* of their might:" in Amos vi. 1, "chief of the nations:" in Dan. xi. 41, "the chief of the children of Ammon:" and in Deut. xxxiii. 21, "the first part," that is, a post of honour and emolument. The Syriac cognate, ܪܫܝܬܐ, rishitho, has similar significations, and the root, ראש, rish, in S. Luke xvi. 24, ראש צפן rish tsebeh, means, "the tip of his finger." In Ezekiel xxxvi. 11, our word reshith, is employed in the plural number, and signifies "your beginnings." Our phrase then, "in the beginning," points to a period of time, some five days before the formation of man, when "GOD recreated the heavens and the earth." We have the highest, that authority, by whom all things were made, for this acceptation of "the beginning." "Have ye not read," said our LORD, meaning in that sacred record which puny modern scholarship presumes to question, "that He who made them *at the beginning*, made them a male and a female?"

And what is the meaning or scope of the Hebrew verb, in our authorized version, rendered by "created?" To

English ears and understandings the sound comes naturally, and by long use almost irresistibly, as the representation of an *ex nihilo* creation. But in the teeth of all the Rabbinical and Cabbalistic fancies of Jewish Commentators, and with reverential deference to modern criticism, in the Hebrew Bible, it is not so; there Moses has sanctioned and recorded,—has beyond rational question and all critical doubt, written, "GOD re-created," in the sense of renovated or created anew. Hereby we are instructed that GOD reduced to their present order, and harmony, and beauty,—made habitable and self-sustaining, the aerial, fluid and solid constituent elements of the world we live in. R. D. Kimchi, in his endeavour to ascertain the shades of difference existing between the terms used in the Mosaic Cosmogony, has assumed that our Hebrew verb בָּרָא, Bara, has the full signification of *ex nihilo creavit*. Our own Castell, a profound and self-denying scholar, has entertained the same groundless notion. And even our illustrious Bryan Walton, was not inaccessible to this oblique ray of Rabbinical ignis fatuus; otherwise, these two last worthies would not have encumbered, the latter his glorious Polyglott Bible, and the former his, in all other respects, most valuable Lexicon, with a weight of senseless Rabbinical rubbish. I have not met with any scholar of eminence, who has maintained this opinion, until I was startled with it in the very able and eloquent Essay, "On the Mosaic Record of Creation," in reply to "Essays and Reviews." I have not only the strong feeling of regret, but moreover, a sense of liability to the heavy charge of presumption, in my venture to differ from the learned author of that brilliant Essay. He will, however, should this presumption ever reach his ear, or obtrude itself upon his eye, rather sympathize than be offended with me, who rather seek to uphold with feeble hands the Truth of GOD, than to conciliate by suppression of convictions the favour, or the applause of man. Our translators

have rendered this verb, approved and employed by Moses, בָּרָא, Bārā, by the Latin-born verb, created, and that without qualification. In thus rendering it they have been in error, if the opinions of the profoundly learned, if the sense of cognate words in kindred languages, if circumstances attending the process of reducing to form and order the earth on which we live; if phenomena, that teach another doctrine from the bowels of the earth; if all these, taken together, may establish that, which the highly accomplished and inspired Prophet, writing in his own language, might be assumed without these vouchers to determine. And is there want of reverence, I would ask, towards the Great and Bountiful Creator, in thus accepting His Word as He commanded and inspired His holy Prophet to deliver it? Is there aught of irreverence in believing that at the time of man's creation, whatever He had the will to have done for other beings, or for other races, GOD did not, as He declares He did not, create *ex nihilo*, but reduced to order, to utility, and to its visible and wondrous loveliness the earth, intended for the habitation of His creatures? There is no question of the power of GOD to do whatever omnipotence may accomplish; but of the time when that power was exercised. Irreverence might rather be imputed, though impute irreverence I would not, to those who wrest the language of Holy Scripture to a sense it does not bear, and limit the Sovereignty of Eternal Majesty over this atom in His dominions, to a few thousands of years. It is not questioned, whether the Great Architect of the universe could have created man *ex nihilo*; yet, "The LORD GOD created man in His own Image," and "formed man of the dust of the ground." It is not denied, that the same dread Power could have created Eve *ex nihilo*. It was, nevertheless, His supreme pleasure to create, literally "to build," woman of the matter detached from man. It is necessary to the determination of the power of the terms rendered in our venerable translation by the

verbs, to form, to create, to make, that we become familiar with them, and perceive, as a nearer view of them will easily bring us to perceive, their similar and interchangeable, or convertible, meaning and value.

We will pursue this investigation a little further, having this object in view. God is recorded, not to have formed, not to have made, but to have "created great whales;" here the verb, בָּרָא, bara, the verb rendered "created" in the first verse, is employed: God "made the beast of the earth," here עָשָׂה, asah, is found. "And God said, Let us make man:" here again we have עָשָׂה, asah. But in the record, "so God created man," there is exhibited the verb בָּרָא, bara; and in chap. ii. v. 7, when the same act is recapitulated, we have the process, "formed," expressed in the third creative, or cosmogonic, term, יָצַר, yatsar. We have then, these three verbs, used interchangeably for the same and similar acts; and that, whether the materials out of which the formation takes place, be supplied, or specified, or not. There has been enough said, I imagine, to prove that there is no eminence enjoyed by any one of these terms, but since one of them, I need not write בָּרָא, bara, has been elevated by cabbalistic canonization to an importance it is neither by origin nor usage entitled to, and a theory is flowing from its apex, I must adduce further evidence of that simple term's simplicity. It has been seen, that the verbs employed in the Mosaic Cosmogony, are, בָּרָא bara, עָשָׂה asah, and יָצַר yatsar. Now let us look more nearly into these prominent Hebrew words, taking in the first place בָּרָא. The Arabic word, derived from it, means, to cut, to cut off, to fit, to adapt. And the Syriac derivative, ܒܪܐ, is loosely explained by *created*, in an unqualified manner.[1] As the signification of our

[1] Yet though the seemingly absolute term, created, is not adverbially qualified, its application brings it down to the sober standard. Take for ex-

Hebrew word Buxtorf, Gesenius and Lee, give *created anew*, adapted, made newly, or anew. As its primary meaning Gesenius gives, he cut, cut out, carved, planed down, polished. And our own illustrious Lee characterizes it as "a silly theory," that this means, created *ex nihilo*.

A reference to the Lexicons, will furnish abundant proof that בָּרָא is used on various occasions by as various agents. Places in Joshua, chap. xvii. verses 15, 18, exhibit this verb in the sense of cutting down trees. And this is only one of very many places, where our verb acknowledges agents and agencies, other than the LORD JEHOVAH. And even were it otherwise, were this verb reserved to the sole use of the great JEHOVAH, I must take leave to say, that objectless reservation would appear to me more like a subsequent change, arising from a groundless abstinence,[1] than many places that are so reasoned upon and accounted for. The next Cosmogonic verb is עָשָׂה, asah, which signifies, he worked, laboured; and thence by *metonymia*, he made, fabricated, produced. The primary idea, says Gesenius, lies probably in forming, shaping, cutting. He imagines this verb may have been formed by softening the consonants in the verb עָצַב, ātsăv, he formed, fash-

ample, S. Mark xiii. 19, ܡܶܢ ܫܘܪܝܐ ܕܒܪܝܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܒܪܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܟܠܗ ܒܪܝܬܐ from the beginning of the creation which GOD created; a creation undefined, is alluded to. The same may be predicated of S. Luke xi. 50, ܡܢ ܕܒܪܬ ܥܠܡܐ, from the time when the world was created. But in Ephes. iv. 24; Col. i. 16; S. Mark ii. 27; Ephes. ii. 10, this verb is exhibited as the synonyme of, made, formed, fashioned, and the like.

[1] The Author of the able Essay on "The Mosaic Record of Creation," has laid strong emphasis on the circumstance that the Hebrew term for Creator, has been no where used, except when applied to GOD. But is not this a mere Jewish notion, or manner of paying homage to the Creator? Is not Jewish abstinence from the naming the name, JEHOVAH, founded in Jewish misapprehension? I think no stress can be laid, nor any hypothesis be placed, upon the circumstance.

ioned.[1] As there is no especial prominence claimed for this word, no more needs to be said about it.

The third verb, prominently employed in the Mosaic Cosmogony, is יָצַר, yatsar, he formed, fashioned, made. It is, says Buxtorf, "*propriè figulorum verbum; latiùs tamen inde usurpatur.*" The Syriac cognate, ܨܘܪܬܐ, tsurtho, means an image. In Isa. xliii. 7, these three Hebrew verbs are employed in what appears by the particle, אַף, prefixed to the last clause, to be an ascending climax; if so, בָּרָא forms the first or lowest step of that ascent. The passage reads: כֹּל הַנִּקְרָא בִשְׁמִי וְלִכְבוֹדִי בְּרָאתִיו יְצַרְתִּיו אַף־עָשִׂיתִיו׃ Our venerable Version has this rendered thus: "Even every one that is called by My Name: for I have created him for My glory, I have formed him, yea, I have made him." The particle before the last verb, emphatically marks some greater and important circumstances in this anthropogony. It must be plainly apparent by this time, that no one of these Hebrew verbs is of notable and exclusive force, and much less of Divine appropriation; they are used as convertible, and almost as synonymous, terms. Besides these texts of Holy Writ already put forward, I might easily cite many others, and they would afford as many further arguments. If the reader, to see one more example, will turn to Isa. xlv. 7, he will read: "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these *things*." In this passage, the light is formed, not by the verb בָּרָא, bara, but by יָצַר, yatsar; the darkness, a negative condition, is *created* by בָּרָא: the Divine Agent *makes* peace by עָשָׂה, asah; He *creates* evil by בָּרָא: He

[1] Gesenius sees in fingendo the origin of facio, and in μηχανή the source of the Latin machina, machinor; Germ. machen, and the English make. Our Hebrew verb, עָשָׂה, has several shades of signification lying in cognate verbs.

does "all these *things*" by עָשָׂה, asah.[1] Our version has continued the rendering of בָּרָא, bara, by the verb *create*; but that version, beautiful and venerated as its language is, too loudly calls for revision, to be allowed to conclude the question, or to exclude philological light.

Let us take a view of the several parts in this group of operations. Is there any behest, upon which an emphasis communicated by the dignity of the word applied, would be more desirable and more graceful, than that by which Elohim said, "I form the light?" Yet we perceive that the word of hypothetic dignity, is not employed, but יָצַר, yatsar. Further, GOD is represented as the *Creator* of darkness and of evil, by the verb of imagined emphasis and dignity; but He is the *Maker*, עֹשֶׂה, of peace; and "all these *things*" He *does* by the same participle of the verb, supposed to be of inferior cast or mould. And is our word of importance employed, when GOD created all the living creatures of the earth, of the air, and of the waters? No indeed! It was His pleasure to issue His "Fiant," and the earth and the waters brought forth abundantly. But I will dwell upon that, which must be as clear, as the noonday, no longer. The Prophet Moses, Divinely guided, has described a restoration of this planet, not a creation of it. And they, who contend for that operation having been an *ex nihilo* creation, surrender their theory by their acceptance, or complacent laudation, of the theory of La Place, and their applause of the ingenious experiments of Plateau in illustration, if not in confirmation, of it. Theories, whether Neptunian, Plutonic, or of solar ex-dedition, had

[1] In Psalm civ. 30, we read the term bara, used to specify the formation of man and living creatures, and a Hebrew verb, signifying, to renew, to restore, employed to describe the restoration of the earth. "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created," יִבָּרֵאוּן, they are formed, or fashioned, "and Thou," וְתְחַדֵּשׁ, "renewest the face of the earth."

a subject upon which to operate; that subject JEHOVAH GOD, acted upon by the verb בָּרָא. As a climax to the argument concerning the especial claims and dignities of the verb Bara, I ask, in what terms does Moses mention the process of reducing the heavens and the earth to habitable condition in the decalogue, just received at the mouth of GOD? Does the holy Prophet retain his notion of the sole propriety of Bara being employed in the creative act? Not so; the verb there used, is "asah."

It does not escape my observation, nor my memory, that there is a text of Holy Scripture, that will be put forward to invalidate my arguments and subvert my opinion. The Word of GOD, Ep. Hebrews, chap. xi. verse 3, will be produced as an inspired commentary upon the words of an inspired Prophet. It is doubtless incumbent on me, to grapple with and investigate that Word of GOD, and to prove, if I may prove, that therein S. Paul is in perfect harmony with the view I am constrained to take of the words, as written, or sanctioned, by the inspired Prophet. S. Paul writes to the Hebrews: "*Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι*"; a writing which has not yet been understood, and has, I have the presumption to declare, been hitherto misrepresented by translators, commentators, and lexicographers. In making this affirmation, I am most sensitively aware of the charge I subject myself to of temerity, and of the responsibility I incur in venturing to differ from every authority within my reach; including Schleusner, Parkhurst, Rosenmüller, Macknight, Bengel, Winer, Seb. Castellio, Luther, the Latin Vulgate, and so, as a matter of course, our English translators and revisors. Chrysostom, whose works are not before me, and whom I am quoting from Schleusner, *sub voce φαίνω*, says, "*δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς, ἐκ τῶν μὴ φαινομένων τὰ φαινόμενα, ἐκ τῶν οὐχ ὑφεστώτων τὰ ὑφεστῶτα.*" Thus Chry-

sostom takes part with the multitude; and that multitude may be far greater, had I access to the records of opinion to view, but not to be alarmed at them.[1] A sense of what is due to that Word of the GOD of Truth, who cannot contradict in one place what He has uttered in another, is the staff of my strength, emboldening me to take upon myself and to bear this, otherwise, crushing load of accountableness. The rational solution of this passage by the application of the acknowledged canons of criticism, involves nothing less than harmony with, or contradiction of, the Mosaic Cosmogony, as I have, I trust successfully, made it out. Rosenmüller, not discountenanced by Bengel, advocates the reading of the negative μή, before ἐκ φαινομένων, "*a not unusual Hellenistic transposition.*"[2] Seb. Castellio follows this arrangement, rendering, "ita ut ex non extantibus facta sint ea quæ cernuntur." Winer considers that our clause "is erroneously supposed to contain a transposed negation." He might, however, have been numbered in the category of authorities, who have mistaken this passage; his approval of the rendering of Schulz, including both in that category: "so that things which may be seen, were not made of things visible."

Our English version is correct as regards the negative,

[1] I take this opportunity of saying, that I am surrounded by an oppressive poverty of books, and am compelled to take on trust, many things I have written. Let this be some plea with the candid for many errors I may be led into, in adducing others' authority; with the rest of the world I have infinitesimal sympathy.

[2] "Adverbium μή ad φαινομένων rectè refertur, quâ transpositione nihil esse usitatius Hellenistis ostendit Heinsius ad hunc locum ex 2 Maccab. vii. 28." And this dictum of Rosenmüller finds an echo in Bengel, who speaks of this clause as, φαινόμενα—ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. The passage from 2 Maccab. vii. 28, proves no more than the antiquity of the error concerning an *ex nihilo* creation. S. Paul's "καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα," has a different and facile resolution. Ep. Rom. iv. 17. The sentiment occurring in Job xxxviii. 4, seqq., is more allusive to a fashioning, than an *ex nihilo* creation of the earth.

although with the Vulgate, not in this so correct, it misses the mind of the inspired writer.[1] But the obscurity which has so long hung like a cloud over this very important clause, has arisen from another source. With the forbearance and patience of the reader, I hope to make it so clear, that they who run may read; for I must entreat him to descend with me to the simplest elements, in my efforts to dissipate long standing, and, as it were, prescriptive darkness. For that which has for ages been regarded as both the true and the expedient, may not be eliminated, except by radical necessity and irrefragable argument. It will facilitate the operation, if I first establish the signification of the Greek verb, φαίνω. In the active voice, this verb signifies, I bring to light; I cause something to appear. The middle voice, φαίνομαι, means, I cause myself to appear, I am here: the passive voice, φαίνομαι, has the signification I am brought to the light, I am made to appear, I am caused to be present, I am caused to be.[2] This last form of φαίνω, the passive φαίνομαι, as the most obvious and the

[1] With respect to the transposition of the negative, too much is made of it. The sense is not affected, whichsoever way it be taken, whether μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων, or ἐκ μὴ φαινομένων, but propriety points to the former. "That which is denied," truly says Winer, "is ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι, and the negative is, in perfect conformity to rule, prefixed to this sentence."

Schleusner writes, "τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα, quæ olim non erant, i. q. τὰ μὴ ὄντα." No one questions this. But his reference to Rom. iv. 17, a place so entirely different; and to the place in 2 Mac. vii. 28, where we have only the *dicta* of a rustic woman, related in an apocryphal history, is unfortunate, to say the least of it; not but that the person using this language, has more influence upon opinion against it, than against the history recording the *dicta*; it proves the antiquity of the error; but error does not improve by age.

[2] φαίνομαι, I am made to appear; that which exists not cannot be made to appear; φαίνομαι therefore, is equivalent to, I exist; hence φαινόμενα, apparent things, are things that are in being. Some philologists point to פָּנָה he turned his face, himself, and יָפַע, exhibited brilliancy, as the origin of φαίνω; but φαίνω is from φάω, as βαίνω from βάω. Yet it must be confessed that βάω has a strong family likeness to בָּא, יָבוֹא, he entered, came, &c.

most in keeping with my purpose, more so than φαίνομαι of the middle or reflective voice, I adopt in this discussion. It is neither recondite, nor paradoxical to announce, although it has not been announced nor made use of by any of our translators or commentators, and has been seen only to have been neglected by Bengel, that our word, φαινομένων, is the participle passive, and of the present and *imperfect* tenses. As being of the imperfect tense, our participle represents things which were at a given time in the passion or process, of being brought to light, or made to appear. But to be made to appear, and, To be, are equivalent phrases; τὰ ὄντα and τὰ φαινόμενα are not rarely used as convertible terms. And hence, nothing can be more manifest and inevitable, than the conclusion, that this hitherto misunderstood and misrepresented place in GOD's Holy Word, must be read in one of these following ways, either as we irregularly take the negative with ἐκ φαινομένων, or regularly with γεγονέναι; in the former way, "in such wise that the things we behold, were made of things which were not then in the passion, or process, of being made, or caused to be;" or, "in such wise that the things we behold were not made of things which were then in the passion, or process, of being made, or caused, to be." And this, in plain and simple language, conveys to us the intelligence, the world we now behold was made, or constructed, or reduced to order and rendered habitable, out of matter, which was præ-existent. The Greek word in the prior limb of this sentence κατηρτίσθαι, is admirably chosen as the representative of the Hebrew verb בָּרָא, used by Moses in Gen. i. 1, to signify created anew, being compounded of κατά, intens., and ἀρτίζω, to adjust, to complete; and the compound signifies, to adjust, adapt, refit, repair, mend, (as nets,) to reunite σχίσματα, rents, to restore; it also means to reduce a luxated joint; and this operation the noun καταρτισμός expresses, and κατάρτισις is a reformation, a restoration to a perfect or right state.

I have dwelt with relish, I hope to the reader as well as to myself, on this admirable choice of words by the holy Apostle, who can well be imagined to have had the Hebrew text of Moses in his eye, when he selected and wrote it. It cannot but seem most strange, that so many very learned, very pains-taking and most laborious scholars, should have swerved from and missed the truth in this matter; should have been inaccessible to the plainest dictates of the most ordinary canons of human language; had not a clue to their embarrassment and their consequent tortuous procedure been perceptible. Their and their humbler followers' anxiety and study have been, how they might reconcile this passage in the writings of S. Paul, with their erroneous acceptation of that in Gen. i. 1, of Moses; and they have pressed into their service, an uncanonical treatment of an obscure text, and even distorted the construction of that text, in their earnestness to effect their mistaken service. Yet all their labour and all their earnestness, were unavailing, as far as the produce of a translation is concerned. For the translations so rendered, as well as the text so viewed, have been an inexhaustible source of explanation amongst the learned, and of impenetrable obscurity to the simpler student of the Bible. Every Biblical scholar is acquainted with a similar confusion, dictated by no seeming expediency, but proceeding rather from negligence of the scope of the imperfect tense, in the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes. When Simon's crew had enclosed a vast number of fishes, we read in our version, "their net brake." Now the verb employed, "διερρήγνυτο," S. Luke v. 6, signifies a rupture so complete, as to let go whatever may have been contained; even ῥήξει, ibid. v. 37, carries this meaning, though not intensified by the preposition διά; and such positive rupture of the net would have frustrated our LORD's gracious purpose. Still more so; and a benevolence would have

resulted in an injury, had the ships sunk; and they are as surely represented to have sunk, as the nets to have broken, with the weight of the fishes taken. This however was so obvious, and the consequences so apparent, that the imperfect time is duly marked, and the rendering is, "so that they began to sink." They were in the act of sinking; they were ready to sink; they sank not. So their net was ready to break: "parum abfuit quin rumperentur retia," as Schleusner has it *sub voce*, and Rosenmüller *ad locum*. Here then, both in our text under discussion, and these ancillary examples, we have a form and mode of expression, exquisitely calculated to express an action, or event, inchoate and not complete, so wrested in the passage from S. Paul, as to entirely conceal the meaning; so perverted in the place from the Gospel of S. Luke, as to represent the frustration of our LORD'S gracious design; and again, so legitimately accepted in the succeeding versicle, as to conceive and to transmit the intention of the writer. I must take leave to observe, that there are errors of graver importance in our English Version, whose source is a misapprehension, or neglect, of the precise scope and the flexible yielding, of the tenses.[1]

I trust that I have settled beyond question, what was the mind of the inspired Prophet in his use, or even sanction, of the terms Bereshith and Bara, in the opening of this sacred record of the cosmogony. If I shall, after all my endeavours, have failed to carry the reader with me, the failure has lain in the weakness of my advocacy, not

[1] The Christian public has deep obligations to the five reverend Clergymen, who have revised portions of the Christian documents, and have rectified many erroneous renderings of the tenses. It may, through their amendments be understood, that the followers of the Cross are not saved by *faith*, or by THE FAITH, but are in the process of being saved. The consummation depends upon their adherence in faith and practice, to their profession; upon their holding fast the faith. The process is present; the consummation is future.

in the fallibility of the truths I have proposed, nor in the inconclusiveness of the arguments that support them. I proceed now to give some account of the sacred title of the Almighty Agent in these procedures; the sacred title אֱלֹהִים, Elohim. This title cannot be heard, or mentioned, or written, without reverence, whether it fall upon our ear, or from our lips, or our pen, as a remnant of patriarchal, or of natural religion, describing the unknown object of heathen worship, or whether, as in this plural form it commonly does, it designates the One true GOD. The word Elohim, in this text, signifies that awful Being, who claims to be recorded to all future generations, to the Jews first, as the depositaries of His oracles for the behoof of all mankind, as the Divine Architect, who, *in this beginning*, reduced to habitable order, the earth on which we live. This same word, with the article הַ, ha, the, הָאֱלֹהִים, haElohim, always represents the One true GOD: there is one place, Exod. xviii. 11,[1] I can call to mind no other, where this rule does not hold; yet even there it may be a plural of comprehension, though not of excellence. The singular number of this sacred plural is אֱלוֹהַ. It is not traced by the learned to any source; Arabic, Syriac, and other ancient and modern forms of speech, and signifying objects of worship, have been derived from it. The Syriac ܐܠܗܐ, alloho, is the Allah and Alla of the modern Orientals. I must advert to another designation of any, and especially of the One Great and Good, object of human veneration. I mean אֵל, El. Some of the learned have

[1] In this place the English Version is superior to the LXX., and the Vulgate as well, as Castellio. It is a correct translation, while those are conjectural interpretations. The supplying "*He was*," before "above them," is the one cause of this superiority. It is "good exceedingly." Yet this passage would read without that supply. "Now I know that JEHOVAH is greater than all gods, because in the thing wherein they dealt proudly above them."

regarded this word as an abbreviation of אֱלוֹהַּ, Eloah, as יָהּ, Yah, is of יְהוָה, Yehovah. But, I humbly suggest, it might with more reason be considered the parent, than the offspring of that word. For אֵל, El, is a term pregnant with all those qualities and properties, which we are wont to ascribe to Omnipotence; strength, might, power, precedence, majesty. It proceeds from the root, אָיַל, or אוּל, which as a verb is obsolete, "but," as writes Gesenius, "is of wide extent in its derivatives."[1] El is generally sustained by some adjunct, when applied, κατ' ἐξοχήν, to the true God; אֵל אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, El Elohē

[1] One derivative from this root, a root which means primarily, to roll, to twist, to twirl, signifies a ram, from his twisted horns; and the ram being a symbol of strength, our word comes to signify tropically strength, fortitude, dignity, excellence. Its other tropical meanings, the lintel, or arch of a door, the monarchs of the forest, the heroic and mighty amongst men, I pass by, to make an observation upon that symbol of strength, the primary meaning above-mentioned, the ram. Our revisers under King James, thought right to make a change in the first verse of the 29th Psalm, and to substitute its tropical for its proper sense, rendering בְּנֵי אֵלִים, "O ye mighty," instead of "sons of rams," a Hebrew phrase for *young rams*, as it still stands in our Prayer Book Version. I consider this change a failure. For the offering of young rams, the choice symbol of power, and strength, and all excellence, to the Lord of the universe, was a very significant, and in those times a most becoming, ascription of glory and strength; it was the most apt as well as the most beautiful protasis to the apodosis in the latter limb of the versicle. The adoption of the tropical signification in Ps. lxxxix. 6, is imperative: the "angels that excel in strength," is the right rendering of Ps. ciii. 20; but there we read, גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ, great, or mighty, in strength, and all good faculties.

The phrase, "O ye mighty," in Ps. xxix. 1, has found its way both into King James's and the Prayer Book, or older version. But the older version has followed the Septuagint, which (I have D. Mill's and Carpzovius's edit. of the Vat. copy before me,) gives both the tropical and the primary meaning, "*υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*," and "*υἱοὺς κριῶν*." The Hebrew would read Anglicè, "Bring to Jehovah the sons of rams: bring to Jehovah glory and strength." Which means; make to Jehovah that offering of young rams, which is the significant ascription of glory and power.

"Vox Heb.," says Schleusner, "ducem quoque denotat. Duces gregis sunt arietes." Lex. in Sept. sub voce *κριός*.

Israel, אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה, El Elohim Yehovah; and many others. It is, however, applied to God without support by David in Ps. xxii. 1, "אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי," Eli, Eli, lāmmāh ĕzăvtānī, My God, my God, for what hast Thou forsaken me?[1] This passage is quoted by our Blessed Redeemer in that unrepressed outburst of passion, which possibly confessed His bodily and His Divine Spirit's agonies on the cross. S. Matthew and S. Mark, have left varying records of this exclamation. The former has: "'Ηλί, 'Ηλί, λαμὰ σαβαχθανί;" and the latter, "'Ελωΐ, 'Ελωΐ, λαμμᾶ σαβαχθανί." S. Luke and S. John are both silent as to this exclamation of their dying Master. But S. Luke tells us that "All His," Jesus', "acquaintance, and the women that followed Him from Galilee stood afar off, beholding these things." And S. John has left us informed that "there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the *wife* of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." From the same witness we learn, that there was "the disciple standing by, whom He loved." Had we not the sure testimony[2] of those impious and cruel mockers, we could have no doubt of this exclamation having been uttered, for those "afar off," might have heard it, and those, who stood by the cross, could scarcely avoid, or miss, hearing it. We

[1] The interpretation given to these, and thought necessary as being Hebrew or Syriac words, by the holy Evangelists in the received text, is, "Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου, ἱνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες." The cod. Alex. and a codex in the royal library, have "ἐγκατέλειπες;" a reading preferable, for by it the suffering Redeemer would have said not, "Wherefore hast Thou forsaken Me?" but, "Wherefore hast Thou only not forsaken Me?" The Cam. Cod. (Bezæ) has "ὠνείδισας."

[2] This allusion is pointed to those by-standers, who said, "This *man* calleth for Elias;" and, "let us see, whether Elias will come." Dom. Diodati infers positive ignorance of the language of this exclamation. Bengel has much concerning the "dereliction;" but our Lord's use of this passage in the Psalms was more intended to call attention to the rightful application of it, and the fulfilment of prophecy, than to complain; in my opinion.

perceive then, that here was a short exclamation, not original, but a quotation, which has been uttered perhaps,[1] but certainly handed down to us, in the broken Hebrew of that age; a mixture of Hebrew and Chaldaic, or Syriac. There are various lections,[2] but they do not disprove this position, the low condition of Hebrew learning even amongst the holy Apostles; at least they must have been supposed to repress their better, and that inspired, knowledge of the sacred language, that their style of speaking and of writing, might be intelligible.[3] Let me return from this digression.

We are, then, in full possession of the knowledge from an infallible source, that in the beginning there was a wondrous act of Almighty power exerted; an act of renovation, or restoration; and that this stupendous work was effected by the Eternal God. And what did Omnipotence restore, or renovate? In the first instance He reduced to order הַשָּׁמַיִם, hashshamayim, the heavens; a term, which may be philosophized upon as long as the intellect of

[1] Diodati, "De Christo Græcè loquente," P. 3, c. 1, "De Christo Hellenista," reverently and justly observes, "quis neget, Christum linguas omnes calluisse?"

[2] The readings on this place are numerous. A few of these are: the Cod. Alexandrinus has; for S. Matt. xxvii. 46, "Ἠλι, Ἠλι, λιμᾶ σαβαχθανεὶ;" for S. Mark xv. 34, "Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λιμᾶ σιβαχθανεί." The Cod. Vat. has this place in S. Matt. "Ἐλωεὶ, Ἐλωεὶ, λεμασαβακτανεὶ;" and S. Mark, "Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λαμαζαβαφθανεί." The Cam. Cod. (qui Bezæ fuit) has "ζαφθανεί." a MS. in Magd. Coll. Oxon. "ἀβαχθανι." MSS. in Linc. Coll. and Coll. Nov. Oxon. "βαχθανη." Which various lections go to prove mistrust in the knowledge of hearers and readers in the first instance, and subsequently positive ignorance in the scribes, whose business it was to copy the text. "Lucas Brug." quoted by Mill in proleg. ad loc., "ex ignoratione linguæ Hebraicæ, vel etiam diversarum apud Hebræos vocalium suppletione ortas varietates hasce censet." I give this *verbatim*: there is something wanting; the ignorance, undecunque, is patent. Mill's ed. 1707, is before me. The Cod. Sinaiticus, has, in S. Matt., "Ελωι, Ελωι, λεμασαβαχθανει." In S. Mark, "Ελωΐ, Ελωΐ, λεμα σαβακτανει."

[3] If they possessed it previously to the gift of tongues.

man is curious to prosecute, and the pride of man glories to exhibit, and the energy of man is studious to apply, science; and then, after all, simply means, that which is high and above; the atmosphere, as regards the earth; the concentric annus, or ring, of vapour, dense or subtle, that surrounds and envelopes our globe. The Hebrew text by its apparatus, אֵת, ēth, marks hashshamayim as the object to which passes the action of the verb, bara; and by the prefixed article, הַ, hă, exhibits hashshamayim as, the heavens; that which the reader instantly realizes. This word, denoting heavens, שָׁמַיִם, shāmăyim, is commonly traced to שָׁמָה, shāmāh, an obsolete verb, which signifies, to be high; our English word heaven, has this meaning of being heaved, or lifted up, from the verb to heave, pret. heaved, or hove; participle, heaved or hoven; a word of Saxon descent. As our name for the atmosphere is, *the heavens*, so is shamayim always in the plural number; שָׁמַי, the singular number is not in use; and when we use the singular, heaven, we are thinking of that which is far other than our atmosphere, more exalted in honour and of higher aspiration. There are other ingenious, if fanciful, sources of shamayim assigned by the curious amongst the Jewish and other learned students and lovers of the Bible. They have not shut their eyes to מַיִם, mayim, waters, in its composition; and they have indulged in theories accordingly. To some, the dual form has suggested the idea of the water above and the water below "the firmament." Again; there has been an overture to regard as its constituent parts, שָׁם, there, and מַיִם, waters; because waters are there. Some philologists have deduced the former limb of this term from שָׁאַם, which in one of its forms, the hithpael, means, to wonder; because waters are suspended in a wonderful manner. Others again, and I am entering upon a very

ingenious and truthful, if not the truer, theory, consider this word to be a compound of אֵשׁ, ēsh, fire, and מַיִם, waters; because the heavens were made at the beginning of those elements chiefly, fire, that is caloric, and water. There is at all events a felicity in this theory, concerning our atmosphere, or vapour-circle. Through the teaching of a single word we should learn those conditions of air, which constitute the order, the salubrity, and all the adaptations of our terrestrial abode. We thereby become acquainted with that moisture and that caloric, which in combination generate the fluidity, the elasticity, the expansibility, and the gravity of our surrounding medium; conferring upon all the inhabitants of our globe, salubrity of air, the delights of sound, the charms of sight, and that wholesome coercion, which preserves all things in consistency. This is no place for a lecture in the branches of Natural Philosophy; yet may we see that all these interesting and grandest verities may lie in the composition of one single word. We may conceive it to be far from impossible that Moses, the man of GOD, may have been divinely guided to drop from his pen a pregnant vocable, pressed down and running over with all the philosophy that this age of elevated and vaunted science[1] has attained to.

The succeeding action of bara was upon אֵת הָאָרֶץ, ēth

[1] I say "elevated," because science does surely advance with strides creditable to the finite human intelligence. I write "vaunted," because science is becoming, and has long become, puffed up inordinately by its advancement. And is not this self-gratulation inordinate? Science, truly, is a bright quartering upon the escutcheon of humanity; its brightness, nevertheless, is rather a flickering, than a certain light; rather dazzling, than definite; rather crescent, than full; rather hopeful, than satisfactory. Science is yet in leading-strings. Science can no more walk alone, than a newly-born infant. When science shall be much older and much further advanced, it will have strength to ask itself innumerable questions, which it will be impotent to answer.

ha-aretz, which is coupled to הַשָּׁמַיִם, hashshamayim, by ו, vau, the conjunctive particle. This reduction of the earth to order contemplated, we must suppose, and not only contemplated, but actually brought to perfection, that process, by which the more solid materials of this globe were elevated, or depressed, in that manner and in those various degrees, which were calculated to form mountains, heights, and elevated plains, and to leave valleys and varied hollows for the courses of rivers, the depths of lakes and seas, and the vast abysses of oceans. And the crasser parts disrupt, loosened, and displaced by earthquakes and other convulsions, whether occasioned by cataclysm or ecpyrosis, recovered somewhat approaching their positions, by virtue of that gravity, which was charged by the Divine Lawgiver with the furtherance of these results; results, that gradually took place during that evaporation, which commenced and ended in an atmosphere. These cumbrous elements may be supposed, I say, to have recovered somewhat approaching, not their actual positions, which by their preponderance they had occupied, until those occurrences threw them into that disorder, which is amongst the phenomena recognized by the geologist, and which is eloquent of revolution and violence.

The Eternal Omnipotence, by His power and His wisdom, and these Godlike attributes moved by His still more Godlike will to produce the SUMMUM BONUM, the greatest possible amount of happiness, reduced to order and harmony, and loveliness, the heavens and the earth. We now come upon the conjunctive particle, ו, vau, again; a particle, which is susceptible of whatsoever power, or signification, the context may require.[1] And here

[1] Noldius has given upwards of seventy shades of signification to this monosyllabic particle. His seventy-fourth notice describes it as redundant, an expletive. This particle is the ἐπίσημον βαῦ, the Digamma, of the Æolic Greeks.

its office is to connect the former position with its enarration, the protasis with the apodosis; it has to perform the operation of ushering in the wherefore of the preceding reconstruction. It here signifies *quia, eo quod,* equivalent to, for that, seeing that, because, forasmuch as. GOD reduced to order the earth, because, or seeing that—what? Because the earth WAS, that is, *existed, had previously existed,* תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ,—an hendiadys, or emphatic word-painting of a picture by a repetition of its features in synonymous terms: Tohu and Bohu mean, an exceeding desolation. This globe was in that plight, to which it had been brought by Neptunian or Plutonic disturbances, the awful agencies of JEHOVAH, that had convulsed and disrupted, and left it in utter confusion; its component parts deranged and undistinguishable; its attraction of cohesion only not destroyed. I have already defined the meaning of הָיְתָה, hayethah, as being not the logical copula, but as a verb denoting positive and substantive existence. The Hebrew language possesses no copula, like the English, is, was, &c.; or, as a certain learned grammarian[1] has expressed it, "When הָיָה, means the copula, it is omitted." The unlearned reader will perceive, wheresoever he may open the English Bible, that the mere copula, *is,* and *was,* and *are,* and *were,* are printed in italics, which announce that it is supplied to the English Version and that it is not found in the Hebrew original. In the present case the verb, was, does not appear in italics; and it would be in error, if it intended any thing short of actual, substantive, existence. How long it had been in existence man cannot affirm. His conjectures, founded upon maturest deliberation, and the most plausible premises, are, after all, only conjectures. Geological inquiry is free. The age of our globe, whether it came into being as the

[1] Ewald, quoted by Professor Lee, sub voce, הָיָה, extitit.

theory of La Place indicates, or in what unknown and undiscoverable, GOD-designed, process soever, can only be communicated by Omniscience. And on this matter Omniscience is silent in His Word. Yet in His works He speaks. Man is not forbidden reverently to read and to interpret those works.

The next information vouchsafed in the sacred record is: "And darkness upon the surface of the deep." Here darkness is coupled in grammatical construction with the earth; and may be supposed to be a condition, which existed. Or it may be taken, as our translators have taken it, as not only an additional but an independent statement, needing the aid, which our Version supplies in italics, of the copula, *was*: "and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep." Now darkness is to be regarded as a negative state;[1] a state of inhibition; the absence, or, as the Hebrew word suggests, the withholding of light. "The light hath been, or, prophetically, shall be, dark in his tabernacle," אוֹר חָשַׁךְ בְּאָהֳלוֹ Job xviii. 6; iii. 9, and other places give similar indications of חֹשֶׁךְ being a state of inhibition. The verb חָשַׁךְ, which Professor Lee, *sub voce* חָשַׁךְ, considers to be a cognate, and ܡܫܟ, its Syriac derivative, of חָשַׁךְ, signifies, to withhold, or keep back, any thing; the act of withholding, or prohibition. There is nothing, then, to restrain us from the affirmation, that as silence is the absence of sound, so is darkness the absence of light. There was, therefore, an absence, or withholding, of light on the surface of the deep. Light had not yet been permitted to shine forth from the bounty of the Divine Source through those ministering agencies, that were ordained by His wisdom and goodness to confer that crowning glory

[1] "Ante lucem creatam *tenebras* vocat Moses, non privationem lucis sed meram negationem." Bochart's Hierozoicon, lib. 2, cap. 16, l. 64. Vol. ii. col. 256. Ed. Leusden, 1692. It was withheld, not *then* created.

on inanimate and animate nature. Light was, as regarded the earth, in *posse*, not in *esse*: in possibility, not in existence. Its latent, or absent, essence was not yet perfected to present existence. The Hebrew term for "deep," is תְּהוֹם, from the root, הוֹם to excite, to disturb, because of the usual commotion, or tumultuousness of the waters.

We read in the next place, "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." "The darkness darkeneth not from God:" to God "as the darkness so the light." The Breath, the Spirit of God, the vivifying presence of God, is presented to us as in the state of incubation; an intimation, whether descriptive or figurative, abounding in the grandeur of simplicity. Our translators have rendered the Hebrew verb employed in this description, by "moved;" the Vulgate by "ferebatur;" Seb. Castellio by "sese super aquas libraret;" Luther by "schwebete auf dem wasser." These renderings are correct as far as they go, for they convey the tremulous and hovering action of birds in this state of incubation. The "ἐπεφέρετο," of the Septuagint, "sustained Himself," is in the same feeling, but scarcely of the same felicity, as the rendering of Seb. Castellio. But birds in this state have another instinct; they ruffle their feathers in such manner, as to more effectually cover and more warmly embrace their embryo young. And this loving instinct is inherent in the Hebrew verb here employed, רָחַף, rakhaph. Its cognate verb, רָחַם, also signifies, to be soft, to soothe, to be fond of, to cherish; whence the Syriac verb, ܪܚܡ, rchem, loved, *ex intimis visceribus*, that is, exceedingly. Our word in this place, מְרַחֶפֶת, is the participle of that voice[1] of the verb, רָחַף, which signifies an intensive action, pihel, and represents the Spirit of God

[1] I prefer the term voice, to the usual one conjugation. My reasons are obvious, and, I think, unanswerable.

intently brooding. The kal voice partakes of the signification of the congeneric verb, רָחַב, widened, enlarged, became broad; the motion and the enlargement exactly describing the act *more avium incubantium*, the natural procedure. Here, then, we are favoured with an authentic representation of the Eternal Mind under circumstances of the most lively interest. It is not written, and we are unable to conceive, what was the contemplation of that Eternal Spirit, Who sat brooding on the face of the waters.[1] Man is not inhibited the indulgence of sober imagination; he may form reverential conjectures; he may, indeed he can but, conceive an awakening energy, worthy of the Agent and the occasion. Yet human conceptions, probably not even tangent of Divine thought, are not knowledge. The terms used by the inspired penmen, depicting the attitude, the, if I may be allowed the expression, Schesis Divine, convey to us with most vivid delineation and colouring, that Godlike love was the motive power. This was the extent of the communication thus

[1] My amplification, descriptive of the attitude and manner of the Spirit of GOD, goes not one hair's breadth beyond the terms dictated to the holy Prophet by that Holy Spirit; it is entirely restrained and defined by those words in their etymologies and their application. I put before the reader without comment, the opinion of the learned Bochart. "In creatione, Dei Spiritus (dicitur) motitâsse se super faciem aquarum, Gen. i. 2, nempe ut incubatione suâ vim vivificam aquis inderet, ut ex iis cætera emergerent." Bocharti Hierozoicon: lib. i. c. 3, col. 14, l. 17. Ed. J. Leusden, Lugd. Bat. 1692.

The indefatigable and learned Glassius says: "Quando, Gen. i. 2, dicitur de Spiritu Dei, quod fuerit מְרַחֶפֶת, super facie aquarum (quæ vox part. pih. est) eâ voce non motatio et incubitus passivus, sed fortissima *ἐνέργεια* et actio, Spiritûs Sancti videlicet, rebus omnibus vitam, motum, et essentiam in creatione communicantis, intelligitur." And S. Basil, Glassio laudatus, writes, "*συνέθαλπε καὶ ζωογονεῖ τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος καὶ ζωτικήν τινα δύναμιν ἐνιείσης τοῖς ὑποθαλπομένοις.*" Further on, Glassius: "Solarum aquarum fit mentio, quia materiæ illius confusæ et permixtæ superficiei supernatabant," &c. Glassii Phil. Sac. lib. 3, Tract. 3, Can. 26.

far conferred. The benevolent Energy, we may venture to suppose, was designing a habitation for His creatures generally, and especially for mankind, whom His pre-conceived regard would distinguish by forming them after His own Image of spiritual innocence and personal dignity; and whom, even after their fall from that spiritual likeness, He still so loved, that He gave the sinless Atoner, that by Him they might yet burst the shell of dust, and rise His glorified Images for evermore.

---

3. And GOD saith:[1] There shall be light; and there is light.
4. And GOD beholds the light, that (*it be*) good; and GOD makes a division between the light and between the darkness.
5. And GOD calls the light, day; and the darkness called He, night; and there is evening and there is morning; the first day.

It is patent that, as regards the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the English Version, I have made a change from the

[1] "And GOD saith." The oral speech of the Deity is occasionally immediate. The command given to Adam, Gen. ii. 16; the address to him, iii. 9; to Cain, iv. 9; the addresses to Noah, to Abraham, and frequently to the Prophets; these are immediate communications. It is sometimes mediate, through divinely inspired persons, "in whom," says Origen, "an enlightened mind is moulded into words by the Spirit of GOD." But it is speaking metaphorically, when the irresistible decree of GOD'S will is expressed in the form of human language. "And GOD saith." This applies to the Will of GOD: that there be light; that there be an expanse; that the earth bring forth grass; that there be places of light; that the waters bring forth; and the like. The "ὁ εἰπών" of S. Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 6, lies in the same category. It is the will of GOD that is announced, not the

formula of command to that of a decree. I do this with much reluctance. But I purpose to translate literally; and literally I translate. Seb. Castellio is the nearest to correctness of the translators within my reach; his rendering is: "Jussit Deus, ut existeret lux, et extitit lux." "*Jussit,*" as to signification, is not an objectionable, I almost think it the preferable, rendering of אָמַר, but the deviation from the present tense in *jussit* necessitates a second deviation in the verb "extitit;" deviations on no account to be commended. It is neither my predilection nor my desire, to violate the reading of our venerable version in this instance, in which it adopts the rendering of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, and rises above them both. The celebrated Longinus, in his Treatise on the Sublime, does willing homage to the "γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο," which was his lection, or his memory, of the Septuagint version, as a rare example of his subject. Yet is that less effective than our, "Let there be light, and there was light."[1] For my own, and the satisfaction of the admirers of this beautiful passage, I am delighted that I can admit that, it is *grammatically allowable;* the Hebrew indicative future tense being grammatically, that is by the scheme laid down by grammarians, equivalent to, and convertible with, the imperative mood. When this future

words defining that will. As Musculus, quoted by Glasse, shews: Moses speaks of GOD after the manner of men. But GOD did not speak in the manner of men; His speech is through the power and working of His will." The Word of GOD is that most holy and omnipotent attribute, by which He decrees and on the instant accomplishes His decree. Or, as S. Augustine has said, "He spoke, and effects were produced by the word intelligible and eternal, not audible and transient." In this Mosaic cosmogony, Divine power and efficacy, manifested in the creation and conservation of the things created, are called, "the Word of GOD." GOD is the efficient cause. Much more of the same tendency may be seen in the Sacred Philology of Glasse, Tract 1, c. 7. De Ἀνθρωποπαθείᾳ.

[1] The change of the tense in "GOD said," makes a further change necessary. The more correct, and that an equally sublime, reading is, "Let there be light, and there is light!"

tense can be so used, it is written in an apocopated form, יְהִי, for יִהְיֶה, and the corresponding subsequent member, as in the present case, has the apocopated form also, in order to observe a mutual relation.[1] The rendering of our place is allowably, "Let (there) be light: and light (accordingly) exists."[2] The Greek language is the fountain of this idiom. It is not so frequent, as will be made to appear, in the style of our holy Prophet. "And light exists!" Am I expected to give a circumstantial account of the procedure, instituted, and the agencies, charged with the evolution of this inestimable gift? Is the worm demanded to scrutinize the ways, and to test the appliances of his Maker? Must I be grandiloquous of chemical affinities, of combinations, of decomposition, of combustion, of all the terms of the lecture-room and all the processes of the laboratory? Shall I announce, *ex cathedrâ*, that our globe, charged with self-generated and depositions of extraneous light, and hermetically sealed by superincumbent waters and circumambient vapour, was, through the partial subsidence of the one, and the partial attenuation of the other, at that moment permitted to set free its brilliant captive?[3] Shall I be loquacious of light

[1] Lee's Heb. Grammar, Artt. 233, 3, and 119, 8, 9.

[2] Ibidem, Art. 233, 3. Yet is there a more philosophical view taken of this repetition of the apocopated form in Art. 233, note †, pp. 347, 8. According to the Arabian *rationale*, we have in these members the declaration of cause and effect, announced in similar terms. In the first instance, the Creator commands, There shall be, or, Let there be, light: and, So let there be, was the assent of the writer. Or, more *in extenso*, Let there be light; and accordingly, let it be assumed that there existed light. The illative particle thus asserts its force. But the gist of the matter lies in the certainty, that this form, apocopated as it is, is present or future of its own right, and is the *permissible* imperative only; that is, יְהִי, is a form of יִהְיֶה, not of the imperative הֱיֵה.

[3] My allusion is to a diamond, which was first exposed to the sun's rays, and then immediately covered with black wax. This diamond is said, when uncovered in the dark several years afterwards, to have given forth the long imprisoned light.

absorbed, of light combined, of latent light? Ere I do this, my reader, I had need attend a course of lectures by that charming little professor, the glow-worm, and learn of him, by what faculty he absorbs and emits light; by what influences, or apparatus, he can be obscure or brilliant, at his pleasure. It is enough for me that light

> "At the voice
> Of GOD, as with a mantle did invest
> The rising world of darkness and of deep."[1]

It is all-sufficient, we might in reason suppose, and in gratitude acknowledge, that we know the existence, feel the blessing, and enjoy the charms, the primary and the blended effluences, of light. In the narrative, we reverently treat of, the Spirit of GOD has studied neither to illumine the wise, nor to dazzle the ignorant. He has seen fit to dictate the whole history of this wonderful restoration of our planet in a manner, that should be accommodated to the needful intelligence of the unsophisticated; and yet so complete, so pregnant with marvels, that man's enlarged erudition should scarcely be able wholly to satisfy bald curiosity by the liberation of the courses and principles of action from a compressed brevity. And the details of the whole procedure are not recorded in any other order than that in which they were intended to unfold themselves to man; and in which they actually unfolded themselves. At the time of the decree, or mandate, that light should be, the gross components of our earth had settled down by gravitation nearer towards the earth's centre, and the surrounding vapours had, by expansion, produced by an accession of caloric, become somewhat less opaque, and there was probably some eradiation of earth-born light through nature's, that is GOD's, chemistry; and the very air, as it became gradually more pure, might assert its innate light;[2]

[1] Milton.

[2] If a hollow cylinder be fitted with an air-tight piston, and the piston be inserted when the cylinder is filled with air, heat will be disengaged in

yet still more probably rays from another source, not yet apparent and so not yet recorded, were beginning to penetrate the less pitchy gloom and to make themselves felt in their genial influences. Those rays, though not yet registered, because not yet so vivid as to mark the mountain's shadows, were indirectly acknowledged in their effect: they were the second cause, commissioned by the Great First, to separate between the light and the darkness; that is, erroneously say the commentators, to make them succeed each other at appointed intervals; for we read, "And GOD beholds the light, that (*it be*) good." The Omnipotent requires of the ministers of His Will, whether animate or inanimate, whether angels or archangels, whether the beam of light or the dew-drop, that they conform themselves to His gracious purpose and do Him the homage of subserving His beneficence. The reader's attention is called to the circumstance that light is declared to exist in appropriate language; but the copula, as in all similar instances, has to be supplied in any English version.[1] Our venerable English Bible is warranted in its rendering of the repeated particles, בֵּין, between, by the preposition "from;" "from the darkness;" in that announcement, "And GOD makes a division between the light and between the darkness." It is again only in conformity with my purpose to give a *verbatim* translation, that I have adhered to the Hebrew usage in this instance. This same repetition will be found to occur in the sacred original in Gen. xxvi. 28, rendered by our version, "betwixt us and thee:" again, Exod. xi. 7, "between the Egyptians and Israel;" and, once more, Joshua xxii. 25, "between us and you:" and elsewhere. The repetition in the Hebrew tongue becomes familiar and savours of

sufficient volume to ignite a piece of fungus, placed within the cylinder. And a glass lens, furnished at the end of the cylinder, will reveal a vividly brilliant light on the first compression of the confined air.

[1] "And GOD beholds the light, that good," is the formula in the Hebrew.

pleasing quaintness and ancient simplicity; but in the more exact and polished language of the Augustan age, it takes the semblance of an antiquated grotesque:

> "Nestor componere lites
> Inter Peleiden festinat et inter Atreiden."[1]

I will next make a few observations upon the term divided, separated, or, as I have rendered it, "makes a division" between the light and the darkness. Few terms or conditions, could be imagined more opposed than these, light and darkness; few could less require to be defined, strong as is their contrast. Is then, this sentence in a studiously concise history, a mere expletive? Let us look into it more closely. What signification does our holy Prophet, allowing him to speak for himself, assign to the verb, בָּדַל, bādăl, in other parts of his sacred writings? There is no question that its primary meaning is, to divide, and that it generally requires by Hebrew usage, a repetition of the preposition before each of the things divided. But the manner of effecting the division varies: it is to be sometimes effected by the insertion of somewhat between the things to be divided; as a curtain, a wall. This is exemplified in Exod. xxvi. 33, "and the vail shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy." And again, Ezek. xlii. 20, "to make, by a wall, a separation between the sanctuary and the profane," unconsecrated, "*place*." Every thing, therefore, in the language of our holy penman, encourages us to infer that, he intended to convey the notion of some intervening phase, or arrangement, that should serve as a division between the darkness of night and the light of morning, and between the light of day and the darkness of the night. And hence our text may be regarded as the announcement of that space of time which is occupied by the soft refracted light, that inures the eye gradually to the blaze of day, or forms

[1] Hor. Ep. Lib. 1, 2, 11.

the otiose and enjoyable season of evening twilight; the *crepusculum*, or dubious light, of the Roman poet.

My reader, I feel assured that these words, inspired by the Great and All-wise GOD, are not empty words. They, like all His words, are replete with significancy. If the foregoing be not the development of those words, I have still to seek it. It appears unnecessary to deviate from our venerable version, by rendering the Hebrew verb and the prefix to its object, יִקְרָא לְ, yikra lĕ, by a periphrasis. Our English verb, to call, in one of its significations, though not its first as erroneously given by Johnson, means, to name, to give a name to, any person or thing. The phraseology of the Hebrew, nevertheless, is, "GOD calls to the light, day; and to the darkness called He night." By the Divine will, the duration of light[1] was ordained to constitute the day, called conventionally the artificial day, and the duration of darkness the night, amongst the first inhabitants of the world restored. There is great perplexity in later habits with respect to these portions of time. Whilst night maintains its most appropriate designation, day has been variously understood. The night is the natural night, and the day natural would appear as precisely defined. But some have called the time from noon to noon, the natural day, and others, that from sunset to sunset; the nychthemeron, *νυχθήμερον*.[2]

[1] It must be mentioned that the Hebrew term for day, is from an obsolete verb, יוֹם, to be warm; making the warmth, not the light, the characteristic of the day. Gesenius, by an effort too far-fetched, endeavours to make the Hebrew word for night, לַיְלָה, with ה paragogic, לַיְלָה, lăilah, to signify cold rather than darkness. I prefer to consider it, as do the many, to be a word primitive. Our English verb, to call, is through the Greek *καλέω*, voco, to call out, from the Hebrew, קוֹל, kōl, sound, noise: קוֹל יְהוָה, kōl Yehovah, thunder. The Syriac ܒܬ ܩܠܐ, bath kolo, the daughter of sound, means the voice. Barth, with the linea occultans under the r, becomes bath.

[2] Amongst the earliest and simplest notions on this subject, indefiniteness has prevailed. The Dual Form, הָעַרְבַּיִם, hāărbăim, marks the two evenings;

The Scriptural day is the interval between the dawn and the departure of that good light, which then, in the earth's throes to right itself in obedience to the Divine mandate, to some considerable degree broke through the almost impervious vapours; and the night the time of that light's absence. And these terms, or their equivalents, might well satisfy the present and after ages, though day be more glorious, and the milder rays of night more lovely.

"And there is evening and there is morning, the first day." In my rendering of this sentence I have, contrary to the decision of some learned modern translators, given אֶחָד, as an ordinal; the following five cosmogonic days being so specified, consistency requires, though the form of the term does not,[1] that the day under discussion be similarly announced. The verb, is, supposes positive existence, the actual being of evening and morning.[2]

between that on one day and that on the succeeding, was the Jewish Day, the time when the Paschal Lamb was to be slain. But the Samaritans, the Caraite Jews, and the Rabbins, imagined the two evenings to be, the one when the sun sets, and the other when twilight is being merged in darkness. The former notion of hăărbăim, the two evenings, makes it clearly visible that our blessed LORD both ate the Passover and was Himself offered as an all-sufficient Sacrifice within the seasons appointed for killing and eating the Paschal Lamb. The same interval is the νυχθήμερον of Daniel viii. 14, denoting the 280 days to have been days of twenty-four hours. The Hebrew terms employed, signifying "evening morning," are עֶרֶב בֹּקֶר, ĕrĕv bōkĕr; in Syriac, ܪܡܫ ܣܦܪ, rmesh tsphar, evening-morning, a day.

[1] אֶחָד, is commonly cardinal; sometimes ordinal. The "day one" of Gesenius savours more of the counting-house, than of consistency or good taste. The Dean of Lichfield's "One Day" is pure of this taint.

[2] The Hebrew term for evening, עֶרֶב, is from the verb, עָרַב, ărăv, whose meaning is, to intermingle, to interweave; also to be black, whence עֹרֵב, ōrēv (orave), a raven, and, tropically, to grow dark, to draw towards night: a further meaning is, to be sweet, pleasant. It requires no great exercise of the imagination to blend these characteristics of that delightful hour together and to acknowledge their truth and justice. This interweaving of light and darkness; this interval that delays the approach of darkness, sweet and pleasant as it is found by the lover of nature's softest charms,

The children of science are earnestly bent on taking the royal Psalmist's words literally, and to ascribe to the Creator in His very act of creation, the magnificence of regarding a thousand years as one day;[1] measuring the extent of time gained as facilitating their adjustment of evidence. If by this day they understand a light-day, and proceed to add a corresponding night of darkness, they would assuredly be making out an additional fourteen thousand years, or thereabouts. But these anxieties are

is copiously and graphically presented in the word, selected by Moses under the guidance of that Great Being, Whose works are models of Order and fitness, and Whose words most aptly describe them.

Nor is the word used to mark the first morning of the renovated world less admirably suited to its office by its parentage and endowments. This word, בֹּקֶר, bŏkĕr, the dawn, has for its root the verb composed of the same radical letters, and the primary signification of which is, he divided, laid open; the secondary, he cleaved the ground, ploughed; the third, he burst forth, broke forth, or through, as light through the darkness. Our word thus undergoes an æsthetic training from one stage of perfection to another, until it becomes mature and vigorous to convey with effect the burst of light through darkness, the break of day, or day-break.

[1] Psalm xc. 4: also 2 S. Peter iii. 8. How will Dr. Colenso reconcile this arithmetically?—or that of Isaiah, xxx. 17. "One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one," &c.? It is true that philosophers have found themselves in bounds too narrow in the Mosaic Cosmogony, as that Cosmogony has been exhibited in translations hitherto received. "And when," says Cuvier, "they had succeeded in converting the six days of creation into so many indefinite periods, the lapse of ages no longer forming an obstacle to their views, their systems took a flight proportioned to the periods, which they could then dispose of at pleasure." The theories of our own Burnet, of Woodward, of Schenchzer, of Whiston, of Leibnitz and Descartes, of Demaillet, and of many others, some mere modifications or extensions of these, have only to be glanced at, and that glance will convince an intelligent and unbiassed mind, a mind only biassed by respect for the Word of GOD, that the time has arrived, when the Dictum of the Creator should be weighed in the scale of fair criticism; should be honestly viewed and honestly interpreted. As the matter rests at present, the most intelligent and most earnest seekers for truth read one thing in the volume of GOD'S Word, and another, written as plainly and emphatically, in the volume of His glorious works. And this is a fatal discrepancy.

put to rest, and these caliginous notions, offspring of the misinterpretation of the very outset of the Mosaic Cosmogony, are utterly dissipated, if they will only regard the Creator's operations upon the earth through His Almighty decree as a restoration, not an *ex nihilo*, nor a *de novo*, creation. By an allowable conception of the probable antiquity of our globe, of not only its nucleus but of its exterior rind, an antiquity not restrained to myriads of years, the exigencies of phenomena, interpreted on scientific grounds by geological inquiry, may be satisfied, our reverence for GOD's Word preserved untarnished, and the love of truth indulged with freedom and with innocence. And further, should there arise, as whispers have reached me that there have arisen, from the earth's entrails, indications of a pre-Adamite race of human, or *quasi* human, inhabitants of this globe in its possible state of habitableness, before convulsions had reduced it to Tohu and Bohu, that "exceeding desolation," from which our sacred history relates its recovery, I can see no irreverence to the bountiful Author of that glorious recovery, but the reverse, in accepting that teaching from the profoundest pages of His volume of Nature. I say deliberately, it would be the reverse of irreverence; it would be an ascription of benevolence, which would be a sweet savour to the GOD of love, that He had not suffered the earth to lie fallow and unproductive of happiness for so long a period. Yet does philosophy stand in need of unmistakeable and most conclusive evidence of this fact, before she accept a theory upon foundations, in the Word of GOD unrevealed. At the same time the intelligence of man rejects not, nor feels called upon to reject, direct testimony to truth, which may only have been unrecorded, because that truth concerns not the present race, not being necessary to its welfare. Let science, however, be duly impressed with the convic-

tion, that theories founded on deductions from false testimony, or from fallacious premisses, are more humiliating than tacit or avowed ignorance.[1]

---

6. And GOD saith: There shall be an expanse between the waters, and it shall be effectively separating between waters with respect to waters.
7. And GOD labours with reference to the expanse and effectively separates between the waters, which (*are*) under the Expanse, and between the waters, which (*are*) above the Expanse: and it is so.
8. And GOD calls (to) the Expanse, Heavens: and there is Evening and there is Morning; a second Day.

"And GOD saith." The announcement of this Will of

[1] Conjectures of the antiquity of many of the extinct mammalia and of contemporaneous human bones, found in Denmark and Switzerland, in our own islands, in France and in America, are wonderful and profoundly interesting. Many dates are assigned on less, on more, and on seemingly most, certain data. Sir Charles Lyell is of opinion that, if the present delta of the Mississippi has required, as he maintains, a minimum of more than one hundred thousand years for its growth, it would follow, if the claims for the Natchez man to have existed with the mastodon are admitted, that North America was peopled by the human race more than a thousand centuries ago. Yet, what a lesson of caution has been read by the fossil man of Abbeville! And to what a sane conclusion has Professor Huxley come with reference to the fossil skulls from Engis and Neanderthal! "Evidence &c.," pp. 156, 7. The "conclusion," p. 159, is lugubriously presumptuous. The "*probably*"—l. 10, is an assumption in the teeth of admissions; and the "*if*" in the closing paragraph is the expression, the reluctant expression, of a misgiving after all.

Science has unlimited time for all her calculations respecting man's abode, this planet. Let science use her data wisely. She will find her task scientifically more easy and more conclusive, if she will lend her vast power to the support of Scriptural Truth.

God is in the sacred Text, as I have rendered it, in the time present. And, in addition to its literal fidelity, I cannot but think it gives animation and vigour to the narrative.

I adopt the term Expanse, as perfectly representing the Hebrew, רָקִיעַ, rakian,[1] and the thing designated. For the same reason I admit the excellence of Seb. Castellio's "liquidum." The Seventy in their interpretation of the term have assisted to perpetuate the barbaric notion of both Jew and Gentile, and have rather countenanced the "*οὐρανὸν πολύχαλκον*" of Homer,[2] than the more philosophical expression of the term, selected by the holy Prophet. I deliberately say, the more philosophical signification of Rakian. For I am persuaded that in his choice of this term our man of God studiously kept his eye on the truth, while he avoided doing violence to the deeply seated pre-

[1] I write this word *Rakian*, because, if sounded with the nasal sound given by the French to this termination, it will best represent the generally accepted power of the Hebrew ע, gnain, or A-yin. Professor Lee, an illustrious authority in every thing that concerns Oriental literature, wrote it by *h*, having a *punctum occultans* under it, thereby consigning it to the obscurity of our h in the words, honour, honest, hour, and others. As Michaelis has said of its Syriac representative, ܥ, "litteris nostris scribi nequit." Some notion may also be formed of its power, if we should attempt to rectify our unfortunate enunciation of the proper name, Jacob: the j, to be given as y, would, with ע in its proper place and duly sounded with the French nasal sound, be yănĕcov, יַעֲקֹב, for, besides other improprieties, we harden the final non-dageshed b, which in that state is *quasi* v in softness. The German j is soft yod, or y; but as soon as it reaches our climate, it becomes harsh dg, or j, as we pronounce it. This habit tends to improprieties in our enunciation of Yehovah, Yesus, or Iesus—Ἰησοῦς—Yonah, Yōb, and many other names, and other words. And this is not a trifling matter. The Israelites that dwell amongst us have lost their Hebrew literature, but they have retained their proper names, and their organs of speech have not changed, so that their nationality can be concealed. They are revolted by our improprieties and are repulsed from our worship by that, which in their ears is more than ignorance.

[2] "Οὐρανὸν πολύχαλκον," i. e. στερεὸν, λίαν ἰσχυρόν. Hom. Il. ε. 504, Od. γ. 2.

possessions of his countrymen.[1] For the great majority of the Israelites believed rakian to be spread out like a solid hemispheric arch over the earth, shining and pellucid as sapphire. "And they saw the GOD of Israel: and under His feet as it were a work of the transparency of sapphire, and as it were the very Heavens in its brightness." The qualifications, "*as it were*," which are just representatives of the particles of comparison and similitude in the Hebrew original, declare the hypothetic nature of this description. In the arch of sapphire the common people imagined the stars to be fixed; and above it the celestial ocean, "the waters above the firmament," with windows in the rakian, through which the water fell as rain upon the earth.[2] Our holy Prophet ventured not to dissipate these erroneous notions for the same reason that he said nothing to shock the settled belief in the sun's diurnal journey round the earth. *For their ignorance* and prejudices he was silent on these matters, as "*for the hardness of their hearts*" he was fain to veil some portion of the moral brightness, that could alone be entirely acceptable to the pure Being, whom they worshipped. Yet rays of philosophical light burst

[1] I say the prepossessions of his countrymen. For, *pace* Dr. M'Caul, the Jews did entertain the erroneous notion that there was, not a solid hemisphere but a solid hemispheric vault, *under* which the birds flew, and through the windows in which rain passed. The "κρύσταλλόν τε περιπήξας αὐτῷ," scil. "οὐρανῷ," of Josephus is the recognition of this belief; and a proof that Gesenius is not unsupported in his opinion about the Jewish state of ignorance. But what, I would ask, in all courteous respect for Dr. M'Caul's learning and for the cause he uses it to uphold, were the Ptolemaic and the Tychonic theories? In what did they differ from, and what were they superior to, the Jewish persuasion, about a crystalline, or sapphire concentric firmament, in which the stars were fixed, or placed? —the fair rendering of נתן, to give a place. To uphold our sacred truths unfairly, or by fallacies, is neither wisdom, nor the highest reverence of those truths. They are in no need of this support.

[2] Besides the passage, Exod. xxiv. 10, here discussed, the reader is referred to Gen. vii. 11; Ps. civ. 3; cxlviii. 4.

through even this atmosphere of ignorance, as is perceptible through the "*mist*" that went up from the ground, as recorded in the sixth verse of the next chapter; as also in that more ancient writing, the Book of Job.[1] An expanse, then, let us take rakian to describe. Nor will its etymon, or its use in Holy Writ, inhibit this acceptation. The root of רָקִיעַ, is רָקַע, to beat, to smite, to stamp with the feet, either in indignation,[2] or in exultation;[3] also to expand by beating, or stamping: also, in pihel, the intensive form of the verb, to beat out, to greatly expand; also in hiphil, the *most* intensive form, to spread out, or expand, with the utmost intensity, as the heavens. Now our word is from this last and most intensive form, and well represents, as we shall find, the actual intenseness of expansion, by which the Omnipotent willed an expanse. And it is to be noted that rakian is applicable and is applied, to scattering by dispersion, or dissipation, as well as to lateral, or superficial, expansion; and so to expanse, as the result of dispersion. We witness the act of spreading abroad, of scattering and utterly dispersing, enemies, after their reduction by our verb, rākăn, to dust and to mire;[4] and rākăn is not in pihel in this entire demolition; אֲרִקֵּם, ĕrkāēm, I scatter, or will scatter, them. What, now, were the procedure and the agencies employed in the formation of rakian? This extrinsically spherical, or quasi spherical, body of elastic fluid was produced, and is maintained, by the insinuating and repulsive influence of heat, or caloric,[5] upon water in the first instance and continued upon the denser vapours, as they arose from the waters. This

[1] Chap. xxxvi. 27.
[2] Ezek. vi. 11.
[3] Ezek. xxv. 6.
[4] 2 Sam. xxii. 43.

[5] Chemists have given the name of *caloric* to the matter of heat, in order to distinguish it from the sensation, which this matter produces. The etymon is through the Latin, caleo, to be hot, from the Hebrew קָלָה, kalah, to roast, to burn. The king of Babylon is said to have "roasted in the fire," קָלָם בָּאֵשׁ, Zedekiah and Ahab by aid of this verb.

power of caloric is so predominant, that it expands, I had almost said beats and stamps out, water into a space 1400 times greater than its aqueous volume. And although this amazing dilatation has been increased artificially to a tenfold degree, the fluid so produced is probably less rarefied, than that which extends into the more elevated regions of space. And this permanently elastic fluid, the work of the conflict chiefly between fire and water, the ministering agents of Omnipotence, is the rakian of Moses.[1] Has not then, I confidently ask, the All-wise Designer hereby stamped and beaten out intensely His vassal, water, by the action of His more potent vassal, fire, even to molecules, in comparison with which impalpable dust is mountainous?[2] Has He not so intensely dissipated it in inappreciable atoms, that while the lower and less rarefied stratum sustains vegetable and animal life and affords buoyancy to the wings of birds and the fertilizing clouds, the higher forms an inexhaustible fountain of a fresh and salubrious medium, and is pervious to the glories of the sun and the gentler rays of far off luminous bodies? When should I have done, if I would enumerate all the wonders and all the beneficial influences of rakian upon the globe we inhabit? Rakian is confessedly an indispensable and an inestimable provision of the Omniscient; and

[1] And this is the meaning of 2 S. Pet. iii. 5, as Winer has well conceived and given it: "*καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα*,"—"out of water, (as that in which it was contained) and through water, i.e., through the agency of water, which partly descended into the lower parts of the earth, and partly formed the clouds in the sky." This is a very sensible view of this vexed passage and account of the theory; except that, besides the clouds in the sky, there was the permanently elastic fluid of the expanse, or atmosphere, to be formed by the union of the water and caloric. Throughout this discussion I assume water to be the ponderable base of oxygen and hydrogen gases. See Phil. Tr. 1808.

[2] The vesicles of water, which form clouds, are from 1.380 to 1.390 of a line in diameter.

its existence by a marvellous dilatation constitutes it an expanse.

A few words must be said upon the nature and the leading properties and the consequent advantages of our expanse. Whilst its fluidity and its elasticity are conferring much inestimable benefit and various delights of existence upon the earth's inhabitants, the expansibility of our atmosphere has a primal and immediate claim to our notice. It is the expansion of the air which constitutes a considerable power in its gravity; and the pressure of its gravity and extension produces many very important results in the economy of nature. The gravity of a column of air 45 miles in height is equal to a similar column of water 35 feet in height, and to a column of mercury of similar dimensions and 30½ inches in height. Whence every square foot of the earth's surface sustains an atmospheric pressure of 2160 lbs., and every inch square a weight of 15 lbs. These are calculations made by scientific experience and may be surely relied upon; although they have the tone and the ring of that veritable doctrine of the hydrostatic paradox. Reader, on your bodily surface, downwards, laterally and upwards, for the atmospheric pressure is in all directions, wheresoever it meets resistance, the pressure you bear, according to your bulk, is reckoned by tons; and it is this constriction alone, that preserves your vessels from bursting by the internal pressure of your circulating fluids, and that keeps them in tone and vigour. And this same gravity is in the ratio of the vertical density of the expanse; and in that ratio is its action in the conservation of the restored and reconstructed earth and waters. We have only to imagine what must be the sum of the atmospheric pressure upon the surface of this globe and we shall be conducted to an estimate of the probable results of that pressure. It has been calculated that a globe of lead sixty miles in diameter would represent the amount

of that pressure of our atmosphere. This expansion of our atmosphere not only appears calculated to exercise a salutary counterpoise to the aqueous, but even by its lateral extension to the more solid portions and accessories of the earth's surface; not only binding down the surface of the waters, but assisting gravitation in the maintenance of the *status quo*, the natural and artificial arrangements, of excrescences. It is beyond all doubt the actual conservator of the fluids on the face of the earth, which, but for its inhibitory intervention, would forthwith be converted into vapour by the heat of the sun.

I neither conceal from my reader, nor shut my own eyes to, the Στερέωμα, or firmament, of the Septuagint. Though expanse be the most eligible and the most approved meaning of the most intensitive derivative of the verb, rākăn, I am not unaware, nor backward to acknowledge, that rākăn and its Syriac derivative, ܪܟܰܢ, rkan, have in the simple and subdued forms the signification, to make firm (as a foundation by stamping), and, to expand, (as GOD expanded the earth).[1] And if we should concede that lateral, or superficial, expansion was alone intended with respect to the heavens in the term, rakian, we should not be much at fault in the estimate of an annus, or concentric ring, of 45 miles in thickness, compared with that ring's mean circumference, of 24,135 miles: it would be little more than $\frac{1}{536}$th part of that circumference, and a finger-ring of similar proportions would be something like the most intensely hammered gold leaf. Nor should we make a damaging concession, if we should accede to the interpretation of rakian by στερέωμα; that interpretation rather leaning upon metonymia, the taking of the effect for the cause, than upon the more accurate rendering of a substantive, proceeding from the most intensive form of its

[1] Ps. cxxxvi. 6; Isa. xlii. 5; xliv. 24.

parent verb.[1] And then in the sense of state, or product, the usual scope of these Greek nouns, what a στερέωμα, or firmament, we have in rakian! We have a concentric ring, of 45 miles in vertical density, and equal in weight to a sphere of lead of 60 miles in diameter, which though fluid and elastic is permanent, being conserved in its permanency by compensation, encompassing and resting equally upon the face of the earth and its waters. The *Glossaria Veterum* have proffered *columna*, a column, as a signification, or equivalent, of στερέωμα. Now if a column of atmospheric air of the area of one square inch be equal to 15 lbs. avoirdupois, and a fascis of 144 such columns amount to 2160 lbs., we have only to confess the inadequacy of human conception, that will be manifest in its inaptitude to realize the stupendous volume of the aggregate inverted cones, or pyramids, of elastic fluid, that impinge and exercise their enormous, but most beneficial, pressure upon the surface of the globe.

In the translations I have given and purpose to give of the sacred text, I would not have the reader for one moment imagine that I have paid the smallest respect to euphony. Far more euphonious and more beautiful is our venerable English Version; but, though it is as correct as any version I am conversant with, its accuracy is not equal to its admirable style of exquisite simplicity. It is a version from other versions, not from the most sacred original; the brightness of a borrowed light, seen in a mirror. My literal and necessarily uncouth—had I given full expression to the pregnant forms and the various but most significant particles of the Hebrew original it had been a still more uncouth—translation is offered in the rich

[1] Professor Lee prefers to derive verbs from nouns. But I am frequently found out by my inveterate habit of deriving the noun from the verb, and feeling the force and direction of the noun through the part, or form, of the verb, from which it is derived.

ore of the precious metal, from which the true ring of the holy writer's inspiration may be more surely and more accurately arrived at. The participle, מַבְדִּיל, măvdīl, I have studiously clothed with the powers, that belong to it, by adverbial support, "*effectively* separating between the waters with respect to waters."[1] Those powers would be legitimately represented by imparting a causative signification to this participle: "and it shall subsist causing separation between waters with respect to waters."[2] In the seventh verse I have refrained from giving the whole force and precision of the original, which would thus have read: "between the waters, which (*are*) beneath, with reference to the expanse, and the which (*are*) above, with reference to the expanse." The presentation of יִקְרָא לְ, yikra lĕ, I have in this place maintained, risking the charge of pedantry, or over carefulness. And, again, it seems to me more in keeping with the occasion and the period, when the sacred historian wrote, to mark the motion of a day as something, not so well ascertained and so familiar, by rendering יוֹם שֵׁנִי, yōm shĕnī, "*a* second day." The article, I have prefixed to, "The first Day," is, κατ' ἐξοχήν an attribute of pre-eminence, not of familiarity.

It is impossible to contemplate this record by Moses of the influence of the expanse in separating between the waters beneath and the waters, which were believed to exist in overwhelming abundance above the expanse, bearing in mind the period at which it was written and the admonitory, yet soothing and assuring, tone in which it is couched, without receiving a very strong impression, that our holy Prophet took, and was especially moved by the Divine Spirit to take, this opportunity of calming the apprehensions of his countrymen, on the subject of the possible

[1] Prov. viii. 28; Job xxvi. 10.

[2] See Noldius: conc. part. Heb. p. 179, notes m and n.

recurrence of an universal deluge. His countrymen appear to have needed strong and reiterated assurances of security from the terrible confluence of the waters superincumbent on the azure mirror and the waters on the earth's surface; from the dreaded probability of the flood-gates, or windows, of the sapphire arch being again set open, and the reservoirs of the heavens again let loose upon them. There is a strong semblance of this being the cause of this earnest insistence upon the efficiency of the construction and the Divine purpose. Or was it that, the Divine Spirit, speaking down to the level of this people's misapprehensions by the hand of His servant, Moses, intended the intimation, that the Deluge was not through the failure of Divine power and wisdom, but through the sinful prevalence of human weakness? But whatever view we may take of it, we cannot but see and acknowledge a very prominent link of indirect and unintentional evidence of the historical truth, in the popular dread of the recurrence, of that awful visitation. The prophetic mind we cannot but perceive to be full of that event. His rapid sketch of the Cosmogony; of the ex humo creation and of the fall of man; of the consequent perils of the in-breathed Spirit; and the mortality of the frame, into which that Spirit was by the Creator breathed; together with a registration of the numerical increase, and the increasing wickedness, of mankind; these things are touched off with a masterly hand, powerful in the choice rather, than in the copiousness, of words. But on the flood the holy penman dwells with minuteness of detail and with all his command of language.[1] He designed, or, I should better say, was

[1] For an instance of this we have only to turn our attention to the minute and, whatever half informed sceptics may have to object, the satisfactory description of the ark, which Noah, or Noakh, was directed to construct for the preservation of himself, his family and all living things desirable.

Some modern sceptics question the capacity of this ark. But, taking the

designed, to be the historian of so much of that instance of GOD'S abhorrence of evil and of His terrible vengeance upon the doers of it, as should impress mankind to the latest ages of the world with the conviction of the purity and justice of Him, with whom they had to deal. Nevertheless: had the Bow in the cloud never been appointed as the token[1] of a covenant between GOD and man, that

cubit at, not 18 but, 21 inches, we have an area of above 5000 square yards; and this three times repeated in the three stories: besides that contained in the loft, which was to be finished to a cubit above. Taking every van at 6 × 3, or 18 yards square in area, the area presented by the ark in its three stories would be equal to more than 850 such carriages; and would form a caravan, that would afford more accommodation than would be required. The cubit is nearly 22 inches; 21·888 inches.

Dr. Arbuthnot reckons the cubit at 21·888 inches: I have not access to "Captain Jervis's Essay on a primitive universal standard," mentioned by Professor Lee, Heb. Lex. sub voce, אַמָּה.

[1] Now that mankind are aware of the positive synthesis and constant analysis of a ray of light, when it passes through a pellucid medium under required circumstances, they are well informed that this susceptibility of decomposition was not first communicated at the time of this gracious covenant being made. Had it been so; had GOD seen good, and very good, to create light incapable of analysis, we should consider the name of Eden, pleasure, not so well bestowed on the garden, in which the man was placed to dress it and to keep it; we should scarcely be able to conceive the beauty of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Dr. Paley's remark: "If light had been made by a common artist, it would have been of one uniform colour," would have been no hypothesis, on which to erect a tribute of praise to the Divine Artificer. And nature, as we call the work and the working means of GOD, would have been attired in one unvarying hue of solemn and dreary monotony. But, besides the green herb and the luscious fruit, that was so fatally "pleasant to the eyes," the very earth, out of which Adam was created, and from which he took his name, was called Adamah, because it was red: and the ruby, cornelian, sardine, called by Simonis "*αἱματοειδής*," blood-like, have from the same word the name, *odem*; and Esau was called Edom, or ruddy man. We may, therefore, assume that the susceptibility of decomposition of light was an original ordinance of the GOD of order and beauty; the law that was innate in the joyous sun-beam. And thus we have no choice but to regard this token of safety from the recurrence of another universal deluge, except in the feeling, that our protection is as sure as the light of day, or the gorgeous resolution of that light

there should no more "be a flood to destroy the earth;" had the record of the Deluge never been written, or had it been lost, there could have been assigned no rational account of the terms and the allusions, in which these assurances are embodied, except the conviction that the people, to whom they were addressed, were the victims of a terrible apprehension. Even should we be under the necessity of conceding the alleged antiquity of these communications, and be constrained to allow that they had claim to no more, than the sanction of an inspired Prophet; by that concession, while we lose nothing, we establish that antiquity, and at the same moment realize their unfaded interest amongst the descendants of Noah. For, sharply and deeply as I have laboured to engrave them, my burin yields in depth and sharpness to the skill of the Hebrew Prophet.

---

9. And God saith: The waters under the heavens shall be collected together into every several[1] place: and the dry shall become apparent; and it is so.
10. And God called the dry, Earth: and collections of waters called He, Seas; and God beholds that (*it be*) good.
11. And God saith: The earth shall send forth young grass, the first blades of grass,[2] the green herb seed-

in the falling shower. The aptness, the opportuneness, the surpassing grandeur and beauty of the Bow in the cloud seem to have suggested that, as the token of Divine forbearance.

[1] See Noldius, sub voce, אִישׁ, unusquisque, singuli. Conc. part. Heb. Annotationes et Vindiciæ: p. 750. Ed. Jenæ: 1734.

[2] The verb and its cognate noun, דֶּשֶׁא ... הַדְשֵׁא, is not easy of translation: I have endeavoured to do it justice by, "send forth young grass, the first

ing seed;[1] the fruit tree producing fruit after its kind, whose seed is in it, upon the earth; and it is so.

12. And the earth caused to come forth the young blades of grass, the green herb seeding seed after its kind: and the tree producing fruit, whose seed is in it, after its kind; and GOD beholds that (*it be*[2]) good.

13. And there is evening and there is morning, a third day.

The Voice of GOD was once more manifested in the accomplishment of His Will. His Will was recognised in its excellence, His Wisdom in its design, His power in its execution. The expanse was far advanced to completion; the gross vapours were in a measure dissipated; the earth settling down by the gravity of its component parts assumed a variety of plains, elevations and cavernous hollows; and the fiat, obeyed in the fluid and level-seeking properties of the waters, went forth, that, by their subsidence to the abysses prepared for them, the dry should appear.[3] The elements in this monade in GOD'S empire

blades of grass." "The choice pastures of the wilderness"—the solitude, "*the bush*"—"do send forth herbage." The Hebrew word for "wilderness" is מִדְבָּר, elsewhere translated "*howling wilderness*," to the bewilderment of Dr. Colenso, Joel ii. 22. A solitude may be a howling solitude: full of the howling of the beasts that seek their prey amongst the grazing cattle.

[1] מַזְרִיעַ זֶרַע, sementans semen: Aben Ezra per נתן זרע, dare semen, exponit. Glassius: Phil. Sacr. Lib. 3, Tr. 3, Can. 27, p. 388. And Can. 32, p. 395, where the emphatic effect of the verb and its cognate noun is treated of. Ed. Amst. 1711. For an explanation of the immediate apposition, instanced in "*fruit-tree*," see Lee's Heb. Gr. Art. 219.

[2] This supplementary copula I have supplied as applicable to the whole, as one procedure. As the plural of the predicate is not in use it seems the preferable mode of dealing with כִּי־טוֹב, ki-tōv.

[3] And the Creator assigned to the dry the name of earth. The Hebrew word אֶרֶץ, črĕts, has for its root רָצַץ, ratsats, to break, to crush; or intrans., to become broken, to burst: the earth undergoing that treatment in cultivation. In the same manner the Latin terra, from tero, to bruise, to bray, to crumble to pieces. From *erets* proceed the Syriac *artho*, the Arabic *erd*,

were not unready to acknowledge the Eternal Will. We scarcely need the announcement, "and it is so."

There are few geognostic facts more satisfactorily ascertained, than that this globe had suffered convulsions, probably many convulsions, previously to, and greater than, that of the Noachian Deluge. One illustration will serve without encumbering our immediate purpose: it is intelligible and it is conclusive. I allude to the depression of vast countries with their Flora and their Fauna to become the beds of oceans; and the re-elevation of these countries in a condition habitable and productive. Nor are these alternations conjectural, or inductions from insufficient premisses. That they have been ocean-beds is proved by their containing a vast deposit of marine remains; and that they had been previously inhabited by animals, if not man, by substrata, beneath the marine deposits, of the remains of terrestrial animals. Life, therefore, has often been disturbed by terrible convulsions. But whatever changes had occurred upon other disturbances, it is with the Tohu and Bohu that were the result of the event, immediately preceding the Mosaic Cosmogony, that we are concerned. Nor are we further interested—we should have been vouchsafed further and direct communications if we had been interested—even in that catastrophe, than to feel convinced that that confusion of God's works happened by His ordinance, as the renovation we treat of is the be-

the German *erde*, the Saxon *eard* and the English earth. The Diversions of Purley are ingeniously erroneous on this subject. The collections of waters are denominated seas. The Hebrew term, מִקְוֶה, mikveh, has respect to the immense power of such assemblages of waters. The root, קָוָה, signifies to make strong a rope by twisting and winding it, or its component strands: thence, to be strong: the objective form, spoken of waters, means their collections, or assemblages in great force. The Hebrew word for sea is, יָם, yam, from an obsolete verb, יָמַם, yāmăm, whose cognate הָמָה, hāmāh, signifies to make a noise, to roar. "He compassed the waters with bounds, until the light and the darkness come to an end." Job xxvi. 10.

hest of His bounty. This earth bears the vestiges of disturbance, on which side and to what depth soever it be investigated. Whether the chaotic darkness, which prevailed when GOD recreated the heavens and the earth and His Spirit brooded in darkness on the face of the deep, were the immediate consequence of a Plutonic disruption, or whether Plutonic agency had been previously charged with the derangement of terrestrial order, and Tohu and Bohu were attributable to some other abnormal occurrence, we have no warranty from the Word of GOD; nor is human science of maturity to determine. The predominance of pitchy darkness, the displacement and ascendancy of the waters, the silence observed in respect of even the lowest forms of life, and the announced Will of GOD that even the creeping thing be caused to come forth, most probably in the sense of, *to be produced*;[1] all these circumstances taken together with the exceeding desolation described, and moreover the evidences of Plutonic action and of a spasmodic disruption, as if by the combined powers of fire and water, leave small room for doubt what was the agency set to work by the Omnipotent Disposer of events. It is enough for man that he is made cognizant of the utter desolation, from which the inspired Prophet relates the restoration; and more than enough that he is in the enjoyment of the happy consequences of the earth's reinstation in order and beauty. The dry[2] was the arena, on which man was destined to be located; the arena of his probation preparatory to a more elevated existence.

[1] The signification of the Hebrew verb, יָצָא, yātsa, here used in the causative form, is, to go forth, but not in the sense of giving existence. It is the same verb that is applied to the fact of the earth's bringing forth, literally causing to go forth, the grass, &c. in the twelfth verse.

[2] The intensive form of the Hebrew adjective indicates the fullest accomplishment of the Divine Will. "The Dry" is opposed to the previous state of the earth, overwhelmed in water. So, as Gesenius ingeniously and well observes, "ἡ ξηρά," is opposed to "ἡ θάλασσα," in S. Matt. xxiii. 15.

But this is to anticipate. We have much information to receive and much preparation on the grandest scale to witness, before we arrive at the *ex humo* creation of the paragon of GOD's works. The Omnipotent now proceeds in His purpose; and, as soon as the waters have receded and the dry appeared from the deep, commands the dry, now the earth, to be carpeted with young grass, the tender blades of grass, the green herb seeding seed; and to be further furnished and adorned with the fruit-tree producing fruit according to its species, whose seed is in it. And this will of the Almighty Willer we perceive to have been perfected to the very letter. And again the Creator beholds, or observes, that it be good; that His beauteous works answer His benign purposes. In a very humble, yet a very lovely, degree I seem to realize the recess of the waters and the rising forth of the dry land in the view of the Exe before me. In the reinstation of our earth the dry land by the sure and rapid process of evaporation would soon acquire that degree of friable consistency, that would be favourable to the germination of seed, and the putting forth of herbage either from the seed or the root. In the absence of intelligence, beyond the charge to the dry land *to cause to go forth,* we are left to conjecture the means employed by the Creator.

Whatever be our conjectures concerning the origin of matter; and having no authentic intelligence we are thrown upon conjecture, which sometimes discovers our presumption and at all times our ignorance; we are left in no doubt concerning its entire subservience to the great Creator; and we behold on every side around us how admirably He moulds it to the ends of His beneficence. In the construction and the properties of the humblest weed that adorns the earth's surface, we recognise the mind of Omniscience and the hand of Omnipotence. And when we add the power of "seeding seed," we stand con-

vinced that nothing but our familiarity with these emanations of power and wisdom makes us forgetful to bow our head to the Author of the marvel before us. Let us take a cursory glance at the seed, produced by a skilful arrangement of inert matter by the Master Spirit. Those of the leguminous kind will afford ready examples of the exquisite design and workmanship with the view to reproduction. The outer skin of the bean must not be removed until we have observed the eye, or *hilum*. The *non-entity*[1] before us is a very important and, indeed, an indispensable provision: it is a protection to the *foramen*, whose use will presently be shewn. The skin now being removed two substantial forms are seen, which are denominated cotyledones, because, I imagine, of a hollowness formed by them. Within this cavity is deposited the *corculum*, or little heart, which comprises two parts, the feather, or *plumula*, and the radicle; from the former of which the stem and branches of the future plant will proceed and from the latter the roots and fibres. The cotyledones embrace closely and lovingly the tender *corculum*, reluctantly permitting it to send downwards the roots and upwards the stem and branches; sustaining them assiduously with nourishment and protection, until they are of strength to sustain themselves. But for the *hilum*, which protects the *foramen*, that admits of moisture, germination would not take place. Let us imagine the wide-spreading oak,

"Quantum vertice ad auras
Ætherias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit;"[2]

the king of the forest, shut up in an acorn. Again let us observe the minute fern-seed, that rides on the bosom of the mist and is carried and deposited far from its parent stock and its myriads of kindred: even that impalpable

[1] The hilum is next to nothing, or absolutely nothing.
"—— Sisiphus non proficit hilum."—Cic. Tusc. ex Poetâ ignoto.

[2] Virg. Æneid, iv. 445, 6.

and almost invisible germ is also provided with the apparatus, not a less complex or less wonderful one, for reproduction. When we pay the homage of a moment's attention to the all-wise Creator's works, what an idea do they force upon us of GOD'S greatness and of man's nothingness; yea, man's utter nothingness! The ancient and the modern wonders of human skill and ingenuity sink abashed before the thistle-down, that floats on the air and bears along the germ of a life life-giving. These works of the august Designer proceeded in orderly obedience to His will. "And the earth caused to come forth the young blades of grass, the herb seeding seed after its kind: and the tree producing fruit, whose seed is in it, after its kind."

But in all His works, even these marvellous works, works beyond and beside His ordinary procedures, the Almighty has a plan, a mode of action and ministering agencies; these are all His; His instruments, His tools, His very hands; and the works, by these done, are His works. In his Cosmogony the holy Prophet keeps out of sight the agents and the means, employed by the supreme Designer. And thus he erects an example of the sublime, which no genius or language can approach, and which enchains and absorbs the reader. Yet the sublime and the grand are nought, compared with the truth revealed. We render due admiration to the sublime; to truth we pay the willing homage of the bended knee. We bow the head to the supreme behest, Let the dry land be herbed with herbage. But as we are sure that the mallet and the chisel were in the hands, and were directed by the skill, of Him, who has educed from the shapeless block some marvel of grace and beauty, so certain are we that JEHOVAH'S will, concerning the flora of the renovated earth, was entrusted to, and accomplished by, heat and moisture; His prescriptive agents in these matters. As to the moisture, the softening and enriching the dry land, we are at no loss to form

reasonable hypotheses. The evaporation, which arose into the expanse during the light and warmth of day, had the effect of drying the land; but part of it, condensed by the chill of the darkness of night, fell and watered the whole face of the earth. In his sketch of the Cosmogony the holy Prophet makes no communication upon the subject; but we find it minutely registered in the recapitulation.[1] As to the warmth required to promote the vegetation that was willed to take place, we have at present no record. With the facility, with which the GOD of the Israelites charged the east wind to bring and, again, the west wind to take away, the plague of locusts, with the same facility would He supply the heat as well as the moisture, indispensable to the completion of His purpose. We may rest awhile, with the fullest persuasion, that heat was in close alliance with the fattening dews in the duty of clothing the earth with verdure.

---

14. And GOD saith: There shall be[2] places of light[3] in the expanse of the heavens for[4] to divide between the day and between the night; even as heretofore they have been[5] for signs of seasons[6] and for days and years.

[1] Gen. ii. 6.

[2] The verb is in the singular number. As it is in the present, or future tense, it may signify, there is; or, there shall be; and, in its apocopated form, may be rendered, be there; or, let there be.

[3] Not lights, but places of, or for, light.

[4] The particle, ל, expresses the object, or purpose.

[5] The verb is in the præterite tense.

[6] The *vau* here causes the two nouns to coalesce, as Hendiadys, presenting one idea. See Gesenius.

15. Yea,[1] they have heretofore existed[2] for places of light in the expanse of the heavens; to give light upon the earth; and it shall be so.[3]
16. And GOD continues to appoint[4] the two places of light the great: the place of light the great, for the rule of the day: and the place of light the small, for the rule of the night; the stars also.
17. And GOD continues to place them in the expanse of the heavens for to cause light upon the earth:
18. And for to rule in[5] the day and in the night: and for to divide between the light and between the darkness: and GOD beholds that (*it be*) good.
19. And there is evening and there is morning, a fourth day.

Once more the awful will of the Creator goes forth. In the present instance that will is, that places of light shall exist, or appear, in the expanse of the heavens. We have been conducted through the state of darkness; we have witnessed all the ameliorations consequent upon the accession of light; we now arrive at that more complete developement, wherein the full blaze of the source, or place, of light bursts upon an awakened world. I deliberately write *the source*, as that which the Omnipotent designer

[1] The vau is intensive, or cumulative.

[2] The verb is in the præterite tense.

[3] The verb, in the apocopate form, may signify, is, shall be; or, be it.

[4] The force of the present tense is, that GOD is appointing, which is equivalent to continues appointing, or, more euphoniously, continues to appoint. The verb, āsăh, has this signification frequently. With the particle, ל, as in this place, it means, to cause the object to become something. "I will make thee for a great nation." Gen. xii. 2; xlvi. 3. Also to constitute, or appoint, to an office: *It is* "JEHOVAH, who made"—that is, appointed—"Moses and Aaron." 1 Sam. xii. 6. Jeroboam "made priests of the lowest of the people," that is, constituted, or appointed priests. 1 Kings xii. 31.

[5] I have preferred *in* to "over," as the more genuine signification of the Hebrew particle, ב.

constituted, or ordained to be, the source of light. For it is, beyond doubt, the same light, to which was, and again is, committed the province of distinguishing between the day, that is the light, and the night, that is the darkness. This advance in the work of renovating the heavens and the earth is a very important one. The earth is now no longer a partaker of light as it was refracted by an expanse, or atmosphere, more or less dense, but glowed beneath the direct beams of the orb of day, and enjoyed the light reflected by the queen of the darkness.

The announcement, contained in these words of Holy Writ, is made in terms of great peculiarity. The predicate is not in formal, but in logical,[1] accord with the subject. For we have no need to regard the predicate as a mere formula, preserved throughout this series of behests in order to mark some ideal connection, or relation, in the terms employed. Though a great and a small, greater and smaller, light are spoken of by the holy Prophet, writing down to the level of the science of the people for whom he wrote, one only is κατ' ἐξοχήν the place of light; the inferior orb being merely the vehicle of borrowed light. Therefore, we may presume, the predicate is adapted to declare the apparent beginning to be, or the appearance, of one place of light only. Whatever be the view a deference to the canons of human language and a reverence of the Word of GOD may suggest, so it is, that the Omnipotent wills the greater and the lesser and the little orbs of light to be, or to appear. And in this conviction with regard to the scope of the sacred text the reader may not for an instant imagine, that the author of these pages questions the creative power of Omnipotence, with reference to the two greater, or, in contemplation of their semblance, the far off lesser orbs of light. Beyond all ques-

[1] See Lee's Heb. Grammar: art. 215. 9.

tion that great Being, who at some period, not revealed, caused those orbs of light to be: beyond all question He, who fashioned and projected and prescribed their paths to all these goodly orbs; orbs, which even in this our Solar System reckon distances by hundreds of millions of miles and exercise the control of attraction and acceleration of velocity over spheres thus distant, and whose diameters are measured by thousands of miles; and who by His law of gravitation, or attraction, holds these enormous and most distant globes to their orderly and harmonious revolutions: beyond all question, I repeat, the Author of this Solar System alone, must be acknowledged to be a Being of infinite power and wisdom. And we further read that the stars, those far off heavenly bodies, as great and some of them greater than any, our glorious centre itself not excepted, in this our Solar System, but described as the distance of countless millions of miles represents them, are emanations from the same Almighty power and wisdom. What measure of the profoundest homage shall we deem sufficient to render at His footstool, whose works, and all of them conceived in the sanctity of benevolence and executed in the beauty of order and harmony, are so vast that, in the case of our nearest star, Sirius, hundreds of millions of miles of approach or recess tell not upon the magnitude and brilliancy of its appearance; that our stupendous system, in which the outermost planet revolves around the sun in an orbit of something like seventeen thousands of millions of miles, and some of our comets excurse ten thousands of millions of miles beyond the orbit of Saturn, yet appears to those distant spheres, as they appear to us, a mere cluster of orbs; that, were this our place of light with its attendant planets and their attendant satellites swept from the universe, there would seem no void? There can be no question whether these marvels had a Designer, a Creator, and have an Upholder and Governor; nor

whether that Being be as abounding in goodness, as in those Godlike attributes of power and wisdom. It is our privilege to know that this great and good Being is the GOD, whom we serve in the deep and steadfast humility of a loving dependence. We contemplate Him as the centre and the perfection of all excellencies; of truth and of consistency, the highest excellencies. And in all reverence we read His revealed Word by the light of the unerring commentary of His works. By the light, I say, of that commentary. For in these days of iterated and careful inquiry, and so of more exact and mature knowledge, we have a fuller and deeper acquaintance with His creative operations, traced in globes of light on the azure expanse, or proclaimed audibly from the bowels of the earth, than in the brief, though deeply graven and most sacred, record of His written Word. When, therefore, we read that GOD appoints these places of light as distinctions between the day and the night, we accept and acknowledge, yea, we bow to these dispensations: they are all this and every thing else, that may challenge the tribute of our grateful admiration. In the Divine behest, There be, or, Be there, we recognise and understand the intimation, that these places of proper and of reflected light shall appear. For if, and there is not a particle of doubt upon this matter in the record of Moses, this terraqueous globe existed previously to the cosmogony here recorded, it had, it could not have subsisted for a day without, all the accessories of a sphere, poised in space. At the least it had a centre of attraction, around which to assert its right of way; in all probability an atmosphere, suited to the purpose, for which its Creator designed it; possibly for the habitation of man; of man, translated without the bitter taste of death; or of man subject to the dissolution of the earthy and the ethereal essences. Beyond doubt the dwellers, if dwellers there were, on this globe enjoyed the light and the mag-

nificence of all those brilliant orbs, that roll at distances not too great for them to be visible to the naked eye; centres as they are of systems like our own: not only enjoyed their light and gazed in wonder on their loveliness, but found that light acceptable in their sometimes darkness and a brightly burning chart in their orderly arrangements. But that these were all of them designed solely for the use and ornamentation of our planet we may well in justice and in deference to the ALMIGHTY Contriver hesitate to pronounce, or to conceive. Those orbs, that rule a day and a night at distances that render them invisible, except to human vision cunningly assisted by art: those distant suns, whose light has travelled at the rate of upwards of ten millions of miles a minute for unknown thousands of years and have yet only now, and perhaps not even yet, arrived on the field of artificial sight;[1] nay! even one of the largest of the planets in our Solar System, that not very long ago[2] lay hidden in its dimness and dragged its tardy course around its exacting centre all unperceived; or that other far beyond it, but recently discovered; these were not surely made, nor except by the boldest rhetorical flight can be said to have been made, for the use, or the ornamentation, of this, one of the most inconsiderable of GOD'S works in His boundless universe. We are bound to acknowledge that throughout His works the All-wise Designer is studiously systematic and does nothing without a purpose. We may not question, much less impugn, that exquisite nicety and even delicacy of adjustment, by which all His designs converge to the one pur-

[1] Christian Huygens, born at the Hague, 1629, a celebrated Mathematician and Astronomer, believed the extent of the universe to be so vast, that there might be stars, whose light had not yet reached this planet.

[2] Uranus, or Georgium Sidus, discovered by Herschel on March 13, 1781. The apparent diameter of this planet being but about four seconds, it can seldom be seen plainly by the naked eye.

pose of a sustained equipoise and an universal harmony. Far be it from us to pronounce that the equipendency of the millions of millions of revolving orbs might not be affected by the annihilation, or even the displacement, of any, even some inferior, unit in the inconceivable whole. The humility proper to the human intellect might teach us this, and a greater, degree of diffidence in our conjectures and also in our calculations, even if science had not desiderated Uranus and Neptune, long before they were discovered, in order to account satisfactorily for seeming irregularities in the planetary motions.[1] Yet, this possibility stated, it cannot be maintained, that the countless and invisible orbs, that are artificially discovered in far off space and beyond our system, were made for the sole aggrandisement of this, our, planet. No more is it possible for us to conceive, nor required of us to hold, that these orbs, once more permitted to appear and fulfil their functions of communicating light and heat to the earth as well, as discharging those functions of continuing it in its orderly courses, were then first created, or then first existed. Indeed it would be far from any strain, I conceive, upon the language of the sacred original, if we should accept its meaning in the sense of their having previously existed, and of their being referred to, or, rather, confirmed in, their wonted duties. "Let the luminaries be to divide," does not deny their former existence. And the Word of GOD is rather, *Inasmuch as they have existed for these pur-*

[1] Professor Robinson [Edinburgh Philosophical Transactions, Vol. I.], informed the scientific world, in his Paper on the Georgium Sidus, that all the irregularities in the planetary motions could not be accounted for from the laws of gravitation; for which reason he was obliged to suppose the existence of planets beyond the orbit of Saturn even before the discovery of the Georgium Sidus. Encyc. Brit. Vol. iii. p. 124, note. This anticipatory conjecture received a further confirmation in the successful result of the search for the planet Neptune, discovered in 1846 by Leverrier and Adams, from observing the aberrations of Uranus.

poses; Inasmuch as *they have existed for the purpose of shining upon the earth.*[1] The verb in this place is not a constructive, nor a normal, imperative: it may by a not uncommon strain intend the intimation of certainty, or assurance,[2] but this would be a strain to meet a foregone and, I think I have shewn, an erroneous conclusion. The natural sense of the existence, asserted, is positive and in time indefinitely past. And the light, that was lately charged to pierce through the lessening darkness of the as yet imperfect expanse, was beyond doubt a radiation from this great place of light, our orb of day: and with his light those rays of heat also found their way through the rarefying atmosphere and united their genial influence with the abundant moisture to array the regenerate earth with verdure.

The introduction of the stars upon the expanse of the

[1] Indeed I have no hesitation in saying that the assertion of the previous existence of these luminaries is in positive terms made. The fact that a præterite may be a prophetic future; that is, may be used for a future tense; does not affirm that it must always be so. If so, the natural occupation of præterites and futures is gone. They are doomed to expend themselves in non-natural senses.

We have before us a remarkable instance of the weakness of human nature. Those Jews, whosoever, and how few, or how many soever, who were employed by Ptolemy to translate the Bible into the Greek language, proposed to themselves the servile gratification of their royal patron by the production of a literary marvel rather, than to set before him the Word of GOD in its simple power and natural majesty.

[2] Lee's Heb. Gram. Art. 236, 3. I must crave permission to differ from Professor Lee in his version of the passage (Gen. xxvi. 3), which he puts forward as an illustration of his theory. I read: "Sojourn in this land; and I will be with thee, and I will bless thee: for to thee and to thy seed I will give all these lands; inasmuch as, or *because*, I have established," not, I will establish, "the oath, which I sware to Abraham, thy father." The reason for what GOD was pleased to promise lay in the oath He had confirmed: "which I have heretofore established;" and which He had heretofore sworn to Abraham. See ch. xxii. 16, 17, 18: "By Myself I have sworn;" the manner of confirming the oath, and by which it was *then* established and confirmed.

heavens is truly grand and bears, I almost think, peculiar marks of inspiration. Subject to the appointment expressed in reference to the two lights, even the great ones, the terms used are divided by a pause resembling our semicolon;[1] "moreover the stars." I have pronounced this, and I consider it, a truly grand and a very significant introduction. It is sufficiently concluded in the record of the great Designer's doings to be referred to His authority: sufficiently remote by its enunciation to be regarded as a separate and independent act of that authority. I have declared my opinion, that the introduction of the stars upon the map of the heavens bears the stamp of inspiration. For while in later and almost recent ages of comparative advancement in all knowledge and refinement there has prevailed a mass of the most absurd errors[2] of opinion, concerning the form of the earth we inhabit, the Hebrew Prophet rightly estimated, or at the least he rightly represented, the figure of those distant and, seemingly, minute and feeble luminaries.[3] By Moses in the place of GOD'S holy Word, here investigated and discussed, and by the earlier writer, the righteous Job, and after

[1] Zakef katon. This is to be regarded only as a human commentary, or punctuation. The very terms of this limb of the historical sentence vindicate its independence.

[2] Heraclitus concluded that our planet was of the shape of a canoe: Anaximander pronounced it cylindrical; and Leucippus likened it to a drum. Our own Burnet believed it to be a perfect sphere; and, though not far from the truth in that faith, mixed it up with a fanciful, not to say absurd, theory. And the, in other respects, able and illustrious Kepler considered our planet to be endued with life, furnished with vital fluids, performing the process of assimilation, possessing instinct and volition, and having sympathies, and antipathies down to the most elementary molecules.

[3] The term, כּוֹכָב, kokav, is from an obsolete verb, כָּבַב, kavav, whose cognates in the Arabic and Ethiopic signify, to roll up. Hence the primary meaning of kokav is a globule, or little globe; and hence, by a marvellous stride of intelligence, very like inspired knowledge, is used by Moses, and before him by the righteous Job, to signify a star.

these by the inspired writers generally, those feeble and minute, but interesting and most beauteous, heavenly bodies are denominated, and in that denomination described as, globes.

The remaining clauses of this portion of the Mosaic Cosmogony being conceived in terms, already with studied veneration discussed and settled, I proceed not to encumber my pages and to harass the reader with useless repetitions.

---

20. And GOD saith: The waters shall bring forth abundantly the creeper, the animal of life: and fowl shall fly above the earth: in the face of the expanse of the heavens.
21. And GOD fashions the sea-monsters the great:[1] and every animal of life the creeping; which the waters brought forth abundantly according to their species; and every bird of wing according to its species; and GOD beholds that (*it be*) good.
22. And GOD blesses them to the extent[2] of saying, Be fruitful; and multiply; and fill the waters in the seas: and the fowl shall multiply in the earth.
23. And there is evening and there is morning, a fifth day.

We have already had many proofs, that our holy Pro-

[1] I have endeavoured to preserve the simplicity of the original as closely, as possible. "The sea-monsters the great; every animal of life the creeping" and "the bird of wing" are the Hebrew idiom, and have a pleasant character about them.

[2] "—to the extent of saying" is the best way that occurs to me of giving effect to the particle, ל, prefixed to the infinitive: *blesses them for to say* would be exact, but would read uncouthly. Yet have I heard this phraseology commonly in the mouth of old people.

phet manifested great tenderness for the prepossessions and much forbearance with the ignorance of his countrymen. He was, as I have already observed, under that Divine influence, that guided him to lead them gently by the hand and by no means to shock or to revolt them. While, however, he deferred to their prejudices and humoured their erroneous notions in secular and unimportant matters, and couched his most solemn communications in language, that should not alarm their unenlightened minds, he yet luxuriated in all that richness of diction and that graphic phraseology, which might engage their attention and fix his instructions in their memory. In speaking of the vast multitudes of living creatures, that should be produced in the waters, he has exhibited a very notable example of Onomatopœia; and also an effective instance of the emphatic force of the verb, acting on its cognate substantive. The actual terms, employed to announce the Creator's ordinance, are, "The waters shall be all of a creep with the creeper." And "ishretsu sherets" informs the ear that it must be so.

Through want of consideration and unacquaintance with the meaning, well defined in the words, of the sacred original, there has arisen a vast amount of animadversion upon this act of the Mosaic Cosmogony. It has been supposed and argued, that this will of the Creator, as delivered by the holy Prophet, ruled that the waters should produce both the reptile and the fowl of the air. This misconception has been made a ground of cavil and erected into a charge of inconsistency by weak and ill informed minds.[1] It has had its origin in the erroneous versions[2] of this

[1] Bochart has elaborately answered the several forms, taken by this error: it has been lately taken up again and fondled by Dr. Colenso. See Bochart's Hierozoicon, Vol. I. col. 55.

[2] The Septuagint has: "Ἐξαγαγέτω τὰ ὕδατα ἑρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωσῶν, καὶ πετεινὰ πετόμενα:" the Vulgate: "Producant aquæ reptile animæ viventis

passage, that have obtained currency and authority. The Septuagint has led the way; and its erroneous course has

et volatile super terram:" Seb. Castellio: "ut aqua natatiles ederet animantes et volucres, quæ super terram per aerem volarent:" Eng. Ver.: "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl *that* may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." There are three marginal suggestions appended to this Version: the text, "life," is right; "soul" is a translation of ψυχή, not of נֶפֶשׁ, nephesh, which means the breath of life, and so life: but the second, "let fowl fly," is an approach toward and almost a correct version; and stills the controversy about the waters producing both reptiles and fowls: the third, "in the face of the firmament of heaven," if "firmament" be adhered to, is the right rendering; "in the open firmament," the text, is only an interpretation, of the Hebrew. Luther gives: "Es errege sich das wasser mit webenden und lebendigen thieren, und mit gevögel, das auf Erden unter der Beste des himmels fliege." The Dean of Lichfield: "Let the waters bring forth creeping things of living souls, and winged things flying over the earth along the firmament of heaven." This last, a faithful adherence to the errors of the Septuagint and all its copyists, is simply wrong; and gives the handle to ancient and modern would-be critics. The version of the Pentateuch, Longman and Co., London, 1859, and made by no mean scholar of the name of Wellbeloved, is the best rendering of this place that I know of. It reads: "Let the waters swarm with living things and let flying creatures fly above the earth under the firmament of heaven." The verb "swarm" is accurate, not as translation, but as interpretation; the absence of the characteristic *creeping* from the "living things" is a defect: the "flying creatures fly" is admirable.

It is very singular that Glasse, "*Glassius eruditissimus*," in his Philologia Sacra—Lib. iii. Tr. 2, Can. 22,—countenances the error of the supplementary *that*, adopted by the English Version; giving the original passage as an instance of the ellipsis in the Hebrew of the relative, שֶׁ, or שֶׁר, qui, quæ, quod. I cannot refrain from observing upon the circumstance, that this Hebrew verb, which is used to signify the abundance of the produce of the waters, is employed to describe the swarming of the Israelites in the land of Egypt. Exod. i. 7. Indeed the whole of that historical passage is most forcibly and unanswerably opposed to the argument of a recent critic, who endeavours to diminish the number of the Israelites, when they left the land of Egypt. "Now the children of Israel were fruitful, yea they swarmed, yea they multiplied, yea they became exceedingly mighty through their numbers, yea the land became filled with them." Every term that could serve to intimate abundant increase is applied; and, as if the holy penman is not yet satisfied with the statement he has made by no less than four most expressive verbs, he enlists *Bimeod meod*, an iterated adverb, signifying excessive excess of the increase affirmed.

been followed by the Vulgate, the English Version, the Lutheran, that of Seb. Castellio, and of late by the Dean of Lichfield. I know of one version only, which has escaped the error: that version is, "and let flying creatures fly above the earth." The English Version would have been in this respect a true one, if the relative pronoun, "*that*," had not been inserted as the complement, whereas it is an ingenious, not to say blundering, perversion, of the sentence. The translation, I have given at the head of my discussion of this portion of the sacred Cosmogony, is as literal and correct a presentation of the words of the sacred original, as I am enabled to devise in the English language. The accentuation, that is the punctuation, alone would, I must think, shew it to be in the estimation of those, who added it, a separate and independent ordinance. But a glance at the terms will be enough to determine the mind of the Hebrew writer. These terms do not, like the Septuagint, present the noun and the participle in formal accord, as the object of some following, or preceding, action; but this member of the sentence is a complete member, having the noun, "fowl," as its subject and for its predicate the verb, "shall fly." But the matter is reduced to certainty by a comparison of our passage with its interpretation, or amplification, in the next chapter: "And JEHOVAH formed out of the ground every animal of the field and every bird of the air." It would have seemed enough to have marked the locality of the bird of wing, that the Creator's blessing to them is, that they multiply in the earth.

We now arrive at that formulary of declaring the will and the exercise of the creative power of the Deity, by which He is represented to have made,[1] or formed, or fashioned, or designed and prescribed form and charac-

[1] We have here the true sense of Bāra: GOD designed for completely forming. The "Bāra laasōth" of c. ii. v. 3, illustrates my meaning: "formed for completion."

teristic movement and appetite to, the inhabitants of the deep and the fowls of the air. In the preceding clause GOD saith, The waters shall bring forth in abundance the living creatures; in the clause now before us we are told that the forms and habits are assigned to these creatures, not by the waters, nor by mere chance, nor by any independent second causes whatever, but, through the means He adopts, by GOD Himself: GOD prescribed forms to the monsters of the deep; the monsters of stupendous length, the whale and the serpent and the dragon and the crocodile, and every thing living in the waters receive at His bidding their forms according to their species; and so of every fowl of the air according to its species. The admirable skill, by which they are adapted to their element, their distinctive modes of reproduction, their aptitudes for maintaining their variously diversified habits and instincts, is the result of Divine selection and prescription. The Hebrew word, rendered "whales" in our English version, intends any animal on the land, or in the water, whose characteristic is length of form.[1] The whale, being amongst the most huge and lengthy of aquatic animals, and possessing very interesting natural peculiarities and great commercial importance, is, I suppose on these[2] accounts, chosen by our translators as the most prominent representative of the monsters of the deep. But any serpent, the dragon, or crocodile would answer the meaning of the Hebrew word here used. The notable and vexed word, leviathan, more correctly liviathan,[3] composed of the Hebrew word, ren-

[1] תַּנִּין, Tannin, an animal of great length. This word is supposed to derive from תָּנַן, Tānăn, to extend, to stretch out. In the Greek we find τείνω, ταινόω, τιταίνω, of similar signification: ταινία, tænia, a long worm.

[2] Or, still more probably, a sympathy with the Vulgate, which in this, and many other instances, is a servile following of the Septuagint.

[3] Liviathan, לִוְיָתָן, compounded of לָוָה, lāvah, and תַּן, a long reptile. From this verb proceeds the noun, לִוְיָה, liviah, a coil, or wreath; and לִוְיָה תַּן, liviah tan, a coil a serpent, that is a coiled serpent,—or any lengthened monster, that can move in a tortuous manner.

dered "whales," tannin, or tan, and a prefix from a verb signifying a tortuous gait, an obliquity of motion, or a purpose to entangle by coils, well represents man's subtle spiritual enemy metaphorically; naturally it is a synonymous term with that, which represents all the monsters of lengthened forms on the land, or in the waters: Bochart advocates its signification of the crocodile, but Lee truly denies the tortuous power of that animal. I have desired to record an opinion; but I shrink from a controversy, in which so great names are opposed. Length is the property represented in "tan," and the Jackal, outstretched in its body, head and tail as it runs, is included in that designation. It will not escape the sedulous reader, that I have preferred to render the Hebrew terms, leminehem and lemineho, by, after their, and its, species;[1] as being more close to the etymology and less liable to be misunderstood by speculative theorists.

---

24. And GOD saith: The earth shall cause to go forth the animal of life according to its species; cattle and reptile and the wild beast of the earth according to its species; and it is so.
25. And GOD designs[2] the wild beast of the earth according to its species, and also the cattle according to

[1] The root of מִין is מוּן, to take, or wear the appearance. Hence Exod. xx. 4, et alibi, תְּמוּנָה, image, likeness. In the same manner the Greek *ἰδέα* from *ἰδεῖν*, from *εἶδω*, videre; and *εἰκών*, an image, from *εἴκω*, similis sum. "תְּמוּנָה לְנֶגֶד עֵינַי,"—"an image (was) before mine eyes." Job iv. 16. Absolute likeness, or similitude, not, if I may depend on the distinction, casual resemblance, or similarity, constitutes species. Nor will this distinction be invalidated, or in any wise affected, by a casual variety, not perpetuated; much less by a *lusus naturæ*.

[2] And GOD designs the form, or shape, or fashion, &c.

its species; and every thing creeping on the ground according to its species: and GOD beholds that (*it be*) good.

Again the will of the Omnipotent Creator is made known to matter, the ductile subject of that will. As we have seen that His will was proclaimed to the waters, that they should teem with reptile life, so now we perceive that the dry land is bidden promptly to send forth[1] animate creatures; not only the cattle that graze upon the green herb, the beauteous mantle of the renovated earth, but also the living things that creep upon the ground, and those wild beasts, whose carnivorous propensities were intended for the adjustment of a probable exuberance of animal life. I have endeavoured to give to every word and every particle of the above pregnant enunciation of the Supreme Mandate its full and legitimate signification. There can be no question that Bĕhēmāh intends the graminivorous and domesticable animal. And it is equally probable that "*khaiath*" is the living beast of prey. In saying it is probable, I mean not to say, it is likely; or that it has better evidence of being so than the contrary; but that the assertion is susceptible of proof at once convincing and satisfactory. It will be sufficient in the present instance, if I adduce the proof imbedded in the correction, given by David to the ill chosen language of the Philistine, who boasted not very accurately in the Hebrew tongue. Goliath devotes the flesh of the young warrior to the birds of the air and "*Behemoth hassadeh*,"[2] the cattle of the field.

[1] The Hebrew verb, יָצָא, means, to go forth, or out. The Hiphil form employed in this text, means causatively, to cause to go out, or forth. The province of the land is similar, mutatis mutandis, to that of the waters. Each element has the charge of production; but the waters produce by swarming with the creatures produced, the land produces by causing to go forth out of it the creatures of the dust of the ground.

[2] 1 Sam. xvii. 44.

But David returns the defiance, as the veritable Hebrew champion of the LORD of Hosts; and avows his conviction that the GOD, whom he serves, will empower him to give the carcasses of the host of the Philistines to the fowls of the air and to "khaiath haarets," "the wild beasts of the earth;" as our venerable version has well rendered the place. And GOD Himself designs[1] the form to be taken by all these animated creatures; the wild beast of the earth, according to its species; the cattle, according to its species; and every creeping thing, according to its species; and GOD observes that (*it be*) good. It is of moment that these circumstances be taken into full and serious consideration, lest, in these days of scientific progress and rash speculation, the Word of the Creator be left out of sight, and the rein be thrown on the neck of wild and unscrupulous, if ingenious, theory. We cannot but be impressed with the conviction of some marked purpose in this proclamation, that all these living creatures are, by a repetition pregnant with meaning in so brief a history, to be produced; and that the Creator looks to the production, that it be good; that it be in conformity with His will and His design; according to the species of each creature, that roams the wilds, the fields, the air, or that creepeth on the ground. The brevity of the Cosmogonic record by Moses has two points of view. It is permissible and commendable to fill in from facts seen and truths experienced matter not recorded; it cannot be tolerated that any thing that is recorded be contravened. Brevity leaves *hiatûs* to be supplied, while it gives sacred emphasis to every word that is written.

[1] I feel justified in this rendering of יְצִוָּה, whose varied action meets every case from actual labour up to authoritative superintendence. The waters and the land were charged with the production of animated creatures. The fountain of this authority prescribed the species, the forms, the habits and the limits to the things produced.

26. And GOD saith: We will make[1] man[2] in our image, as it were in our likeness: and they shall have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over cattle,[3] and over all the earth; and over every creeping thing the creeping[4] on the earth.

27. And GOD creates[5] the man in His image; in the image of GOD created He him: a male and a female created He them.[6]

28. And GOD blesses them, and GOD saith unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and entirely fill[7] the earth

[1] The verb employed here is asah, not bara. Yet in the announcement that the act designed was actually performed we find the highly estimated bara. It must be plainly seen that a creation, where the material is spoken of, a creation ex humo, out of the dust of the earth, is expressed in that diction, which mistaken piety has insisted upon as a declaration of an ex nihilo creation, a creation out of nothing.

[2] Man is here put collectively for the race of man. By the forms of the pronouns, following and representing "man," we perceive that the male and the female are contained under it. The same may be said of "fish" and "fowl," which intend fishes and fowls generally.

[3] Cattle, Behemah, includes all quadrupeds; though especially domestic animals.

[4] To render in this place, as elsewhere most literally, not euphoniously, I have given the definite article as it stands with the participle. The usual resource is to accept the article as pronoun relative and render the participle as the verb. Thus the English Version has "that creepeth." But the Seventy prefer *καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἑρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*; as I do.

[5] The verb is in the present and future tense. It is emphatically written: GOD created *the*, the aforesaid, *man*; the genus homo.

[6] Here referring to the generic meaning of "*man*," GOD is said to have made *them*, not male and female, but a male and a female: a circumstance unfavourable to the licence of polygamy, even in the absence of express prohibition.

[7] If the Hebrew scholar will turn to Gesenius, sub voce מָלֵא, mālē, he will form a right notion of the exceeding fulness expressed by that verb. Gesenius exhibits the transitions this verb undergoes in Oriental and Occidental languages. In the Greek, by changing the m to p, it becomes *πλέω*;

and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing the creeping on the earth.

The supreme will of the Omnipotent is again proclaimed. And the exercise of creative power proclaimed is the highest on record; the flower of the Cosmogony. GOD has renovated the earth and the heavens, dissipated utter darkness by the admission of refracted light, willed an expanse, referred the aggressive waters to their wonted depths, clothed the dry land with verdure, opened the expanse to the direct rays of the orb of day, commanded the waters and the land to teem with animate creatures. All these acts of creative Will the Omnipotent had done; and had seen that His purpose was thus far complete. What remained to be wrought that might stand out the acme and the wonder of the wondrous whole? The GOD of infinite power is also a GOD of infinite love. He had looked with a gracious eye upon every step of His creative will; and had witnessed with a Godlike satisfaction that every step was in the right direction and every work was good. Yet was there something wanted. There was a more elevated good yet unattained. The transient happiness of the moving creature, the beast of the earth, the cattle, the fowl of the air and the creeping thing, charming as that is in the eyes of the lover of nature, could not satisfy the loving wisdom of the Eternal. Instinctive aptitudes and unreasoning fulfilment of the dictates of nature fell short of the desire and the

μάλα, exceedingly, may be a derivative. Then there is pleo, impleo, compleo, plenus, in the Latin; fulljan, Gothic; fullen and voll, German; English full, and fill. The abundance to overflowing, expressed by this command, accounts for the rapid peopling of the earth. But it will propose a difficult *nodus* to ethnological sciolists; those, I mean, who cannot ascribe variety of form, or skin, to natural influences, and speak of more pairs, than one, as the parents of human races; founding one of their objections upon the numerical increase.

benevolence of the Creator. He could be satisfied only by the *summum bonum*, the highest attainable happiness. And, to complete His purpose in all these antecedent creations, He wills the creation of a being of a superior order, a being to be endued with higher capabilities and susceptibilities, into whose discerning rule He might commit the care and the use of all those His other earthly creatures.

Before I proceed to analyse and discuss the anthropogony I would premise a few thoughts upon the creative power and the Great Being, who wielded that power. A few words will represent all, that finite intellect can know of infinite power. Once for all, then, be it understood and kept in view, that man can imagine no limit to that power. GOD must have, and He most justly challenges, the most unhesitating and the most unreserved credit for all He claims. Beyond this, ascription may be piety; may be enthusiasm. The terms dictated by that Omnipotence in the declaration, "We will make man," are remarkable and demand attention. This manner of speaking is not a resolution of the plural form, Elohim; for the predicate is in "saith," and has uniformly been in logical accord with the singular import of that plural form; and the act of creation and the pronunciation of blessing are in similar logical accord with GOD, not Gods, expressed in Elohim. It must, therefore, have another solution. The Omnipotent did not consult, nor admit to His councils, the Angels of Heaven in this matter. The act of restoring the earth to order and harmony and furnishing it with inhabitants, and with that inhabitant who should rule over the whole, He ever claims to Himself. "I have *made* the earth and *created* man upon it."[1] It cannot be assumed in this place, that we have that grammatical myth, "*a plural of excellence.*"

[1] In this text, Isa. xlv. 12, the earth was fashioned, or formed, the verb being āsah; while the ex humo creation, or formation of man out of the ground, is expressed by bāra.

Moses was directed, we must then see, to shadow forth in this formulary the Three Persons of the eternal Godhead. It was, and we have no choice but to accept and embrace the teaching, the Creator as One of the Holy Three, Who said, "We will make man—in our Image, as it were in our likeness." This crowning act of the creation, an act of prospective and deepest interest to each most Holy Person of the Eternal Godhead, was resolved upon as the act of the Blessed TRINITY. And this doctrine is repeated in that exclamation of JEHOVAH GOD, "Behold the man is become as one of Us;"[1] a phraseology, which no gloss can strip of its inherent meaning. It is taught again in those words of the Preacher: "Remember, above all, THY CREATORS[2] in the days of thy youth." We cannot but see, then, that this was an assembly in the conclave of the highest heaven of the Three Persons of the Godhead; The Holy FATHER, the Holy SON and the HOLY SPIRIT sat at that Board of Council. Not even with veiled faces may we presume to enter that most sacred chamber. Not even with most reverent thought may we presume to think out the secret counsels of that august Synod. More than has been vouchsafed us in the sacred pages of the wonder-working Three in One we are not free to conjecture. We there read that the *ex humo* creation of man was determined; and that this decision was carried out by Beings,

[1] This phrase, "one of us," has been seen in various aspects. Some have discovered irony in it. But it is not the intention of the good GOD to taunt man by reminding him of the fraud of the serpent's promises, that he should become a God by his disobedience. Truly he had known only good, and now he knows evil and its evil consequences. But he becomes an outcast, not a God, by this accession of knowledge.

The Jews deny that the mystery of a distinct plurality of persons is latent in this formula. The Targum of Jerusalem, nevertheless, interprets in that sense.

[2] בוֹרְאֶיךָ; the plural number, with the particle of emphasis prefixed. Eccl. xii. 1.

Who are Omniscient as well, as Omnipotent. Our slender intelligence, dimmed as it is by contact with the dust of the ground, cannot but perceive that, The Three in One knew the frailty of that dust, with which a measure of the Spirit was designed to be encumbered; and that They foresaw the fall of the first pair, that should be created in that fellowship, and be entrusted with the exercise of free will; the sole condition productive of the *summum bonum*, or highest grade of happiness. Nor are we forbidden to regard with grateful humility that heavenly desire of conferring the highest happiness, that Divine good will to future man, that was not deterred from the gracious deed by foreseen disobedience, with all its defacement of the Image of GOD and all its train of inevitable ills. It was then, at that very juncture, at that very point of prescience, when a responsible creature was contemplated and the lapse of that creature was foreseen; when it was felt that the possible recovery of that creature, that fallen creature, was necessary to the purpose so near to the Divine heart; to the desired result of the highest measure of good and of preclusion to profoundest evil; it was at that moment that the love of the Holy SON was manifested, who shrank not from the necessary humiliation of becoming that Seed of fallen woman, that should bruise the serpent's head.

"And GOD created man in His Image; in the Image of GOD created He him: a male and a female created He them." The creation of man is stated in a collective, or generic, sense; of the genus homo. "*They*" were to have dominion; "a male and a female," a restrictive intimation, "created He *them*;" and GOD blesses "*them*," and issues to them the command, which supposes a male and a female. As I have somewhere stated already, this *ex humo* creation of mankind is treated more at large in that, the succeeding, chapter, which prepares the way for the history of the trial and fall of our first parents in the gar-

den of delight. We read in this place no more, than that GOD created man; and that He created man "in His Image, in the Image of GOD." The form, in which the Creator fashioned man out of the earth, Adam, earth of the red earth,[1] is worthy of, and commands, admiration. If search were made, and skill and ingenuity were taxed, to produce a form, that should possess all that can be imagined of the Godlike and the beautiful, we could go no further, we could ascend no higher, than the human form. If grace be a union of power and ease; if beauty be a compound of flowing curves and symmetry; if dignity reside in the upward gaze, the erect gait, the commanding attitude and the majestic step; then grace and beauty and dignity are pourtrayed and exemplified in the frame and the countenance of man, whom GOD created in His own Image. There is neither desire nor a shadow of necessity to ignore, or to evade, the theories or the arguments of science in this branch of our subject. We can with perfect composure learn from science, that grace of form, of attitude and of movement are the effects of structural contrivance. We can hear with complacency from the lips of science, that elasticity is the simple result of an elegant curvature of the spinal column. We shrink not from the conviction, thrust upon us by the same sagacious and restless Indagatrix, that man's facial erectness[2] and evenness of balance are produced by the situation of the occipital foramen. We will not turn a deaf ear to whispers, not loud but deep whispers, of man's more ample cranial cavity and of his larger brain and of its more perfect developement. And wherefore should we? This being, designed by the Creator, is not intended to walk the earth

[1] אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה, eth-hāādām āphār min-hāădāmāh: even the said man earth from the red earth. Gen. ii. 7.

[2] The erectness of the human frame is much dependent on the arch, formed by the structure of the foot.

as a spirit and to feed on air: he is not a mere automaton. In the latter case he would be a machine, moveable, and influenced in all his motions, by the Divine Mechanist: in the former he would be regulated solely by spiritual aspirations and actuated solely by spiritual impulses. But man was formed by the Creator from the dust of the ground. Man, in so far as his material is concerned, is little distinguishable from the brute; and in structure, we must thank science for the wholesome though humiliating conviction, not far distinguished from the brutal Gorilla. Man was fashioned as an animal, destined for all the purposes and dependent on all the accessories of animal life. His organism must therefore almost necessarily be similar to, and almost the same as, that of the animate brute nearest, though all be comparatively near, to him in corporeal frame and structure. When Omnipotence decided on this creation He simultaneously decided on this similitude. The good and gracious Being, who designed the forms of the animate kingdom, would of His own proper motion, guided by His patent and pervading benignity, so construct them, that their frames should be to each the vehicles of the greatest obtainable corporeal facilities and enjoyment. And when He fashioned man of the same material, He could only have departed from the model, hitherto adopted and applied to the beasts of the field, by selecting some inferior and less happy contrivance. In the determination to create man of the dust of the earth the Almighty Architect designed him to be of some, and we perceive, as might be expected of that creature into whose hand the kingdoms of nature were to be given, it was the highest, order of animate beings. Yet throughout this similitude; throughout the frame that was intended for motion, for labour, for procuring subsistence and for supplying the wants of life, for all the functions and offices of preserving and perpetuating existence, it would seem

that science discovers and points to structural differences and structural superiority. We have the warranty of science that there are structural reasons for super-brutal carriage, attitude, grace and dignity in the genus homo. The truth is, the Creator did not create man a brute. He created him not an "animal of life," a living animal, in the sense, in which He created the monsters of the deep and the beast of the earth. Truly He created these actually "animals of life." But man became "*for*"[1] an animal of life: he became, notwithstanding his formation by JEHOVAH GOD and the breathing of the breath of JEHOVAH GOD into his nostrils, *as it were, seemingly,* in the position of, an "animal of life." To outward appearance, TO THE WEAK SIGHT OF SCIENCE, he was not far distinguished from the beasts that perish. He was, and scientifically considered may still be, to all outward appearance and in all the wants, the defects and the weaknesses of the outward frame, "an animal," although he became in his measure of the inbreathed Spirit of GOD a resemblance, *sed longo intervallo,* of that Being, who had that Spirit poured upon Him without measure. He, man, became as an animal of life. But he was, for weal or for woe, much more than an irresponsible and perishing creature.

[1] In verse 20, the waters are commanded to produce in abundance "the animal of life," נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, nephesh khaiāh; and, verse 21, GOD created (and here BARA is the verb) the huge monsters of the deep and every animal of this life, כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה, kol nephesh *ha*khaiāh; and verse 24, the earth was charged to send forth the "animal of life," נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, nephesh khaiāh; but c. ii. v. 7, man after his formation and receiving breath at the breathing of his Creator, becomes לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, *le*nephesh khaiāh; for, in the position of, in the semblance of, an animal of life, a living animal, an animal.

There is not a particle in this book, I should say, these books, speaking of the Holy Bible, which has not a meaning. The particle, prefixed to nephesh is pregnant with all the meaning I have attached to it. Noldius, Gesenius and our own illustrious Professor Lee bear me out in giving all this force to the particle in question: I mean, they allow it this force as a particle.

But what of structure in reference to that Image of GOD, in which the Creator made man? GOD made man in His own Image by a far more exalted standard, than that of form and stature, or even that of sensorial pre-eminence.[1] I make no allusion to innate ideas; I make no claim to innate moral excellence.[2] The condition of man, secluded from his species from infancy, and of man, wholly unreclaimed, overturns any theory that might be contemplated on so deceptive a foundation. Yet amongst human creatures, gathered together and living in any thing approaching a social state, however remote from true moral or religious light, there spring up notions, that take a form and become fixed and sacred. And as these notions are not unfrequently productive of ceremonies and rites that are the very reverse of corporeal gratification, we are at liberty to infer that unassisted man, man from whom natural religion has departed leaving only an *ignem fatuum* behind, is instinct with desires and capacities, which are

[1] The Image of GOD does not lack the "*τὸ θρεπτικὸν*" of the vegetable kingdom. He has this *τὸ θρεπτικὸν* and the *τὸ αἰσθητικὸν*, which are the endowments of the animal kingdom. Enjoying these in a more refined, if not more vigorous degree, he becomes the distinguished of all creatures only by the super-addition of the *τὸ νοητικόν*. Man was in perfect, his most perfect, Image, as mortal man, from the hands of his Creator. His intellective principle, the *τὸ νοητικὸν*, was inbreathed at his creation. The *τὸ νοητικὸν* existed before science. Science proceeded from, and exists only by, the *τὸ νοητικόν*. Science adorns life; enlivens life; refines life. Science by the abuse of the *τὸ νοητικὸν* may peril, if not mar, the grand purpose of life. All unwarrantable extension, or direction, of the *τὸ νοητικὸν* is abuse of man's ennobling faculty.

When I say above, that man was in his most perfect Image from the hands of his Creator, I mean, his most perfect as a creature. "But it is included in the very notion of a creature, as such, not to exist of itself, but from GOD. An absolutely perfect creature, therefore, implies a contradiction. For it would be of itself and not of itself at the same time." King's Origin of Evil, c. 3, sec. 2.

[2] Adam's innate apprehension was opened and informed and toned by intercourse with his Creator.

not referable to, but are independent of, and more elevated than, corporeal sense. This innate desire and craving for a something indefinite; this inbred perception of a want unsatisfied; this eager search for a protection and support unseen, unknown and inconceivable; this is the Image of GOD, though defaced by sad, perhaps judicial, neglect. It is not the image as GOD made it. GOD, Who made the Image of Himself and placed it in the garden of delight, was there present to satisfy man's craving and to fill him with that knowledge of his Maker, which should occupy and exercise that innate desire and capacity of the creature, which constitute that creature's true point of resemblance to his Creator. In the Image of GOD's innocence; in the Image of GOD's purity; in the Image of GOD's apprehension of truth and capacity of knowledge; in the Image of GOD's capability of that highest order of happiness, that flows from the right use of free will, GOD made man. In the Image of GOD's love of the good and hatred of the evil, GOD made man. It is herein that man is the Image of GOD and immeasurably superior to the beasts that perish. He is superior in his aspirations; superior in his destiny; supremely superior in the rewards proposed to him; awfully superior in the penalties he incurs by irreclaimable disobedience. It is not structural perfection, that represents truth as lovely and falsehood hateful.[1] It is not structural

[1] All that elevates and ennobles human nature; all that is excellent in motive or aspiration; and even all that is, in the highest sense of the term, æsthetic in the enjoyment of the productions of nature and of art; all are the effluences of mind. The Sicilian Philosopher, Epicharmus, a disciple of Pythagoras, has condensed into one short Trochaic line all these verities. I beg the *free translation* may be accepted with indulgence.

"Νοῦς ὁρᾷ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει· τ' ἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά."

"The Mind alone GOD's Truth can see:
Can hear His Voice alone the Mind:
All else as deaf as adders be:
All else as night and darkness blind."

superiority, that leads man to love the good, that threatens harm, and hate the evil, that promises enjoyment. It is not structural excellence, that inclines man to act on principle and to forego pleasure at the dictation of an inward monitor. What measure of these emotions can Science descry in the habits of those animate structures, she is wont to point to as most nearly resembling that of the creature, whom GOD created in His own Image? It is not, I affirm, the brain: it is not cerebrum and cerebellum; it is not the beautiful arrangements and the wondrous apparatus of lobes, sulci, cornua and hippocampi; it is not the exquisite developements and characteristic superiority of these important organs; it is not the still more delicate and intricate organisms, tissues and properties, which have yet, I imagine, to be discovered and understood; it is not herein that man's superiority resides; it is not hence that his far more than direct knowledge from experience, that from inference and deduction, proceeds.[1] Science has yet to learn, and when she shall have learned she will readily and gladly acknowledge, that while the organization of brutes, and that of the anthropoid order amongst the rest, is no more than an instrument ordinarily subservient to instinct, the avowedly superior organization of man is merely, never more than, the very humblest instrument in the grasp of that measure of the Image of GOD, that dwells in man and therefrom produces the harmony of good, or the discord of evil. In a word: structure is not the creature; structure is the creature's trial and may, if not held in subjection, prove the creature's undoer.

[1] Ratiocinandi atque intelligendi sciendique verum appetitus proprius est Hominis, quia a cupiditate atque iracundia plurimùm distat. Illa quippe etiam in mutis animalibus, et multò quidem acriora, cernuntur: Rationis autem perfectio et intellectus propria Dei et hominis tantùm. Chalcidius in Platonis Timæum: Latinè redditus.

GOD bade the living creatures to be fruitful and multiply. The same blessing to man was dignified by the additional charge, "and fill the earth and subdue it." The Omnipotent created all other living creatures "according to their species." He made man in His own Image, without any allusion to species. If every word of GOD have a meaning, so is His emphatic silence pregnant with meaning. Science may discover varieties, if that be the proper term, of the human species; and these must be accounted for on the ground of climate and the attendant circumstances. But if science speak of more than one species, she will speak with more of temerity than discernment; with more of the pride of human attainments, than of rational humility and of reverence for the Word of GOD. And science will never reach her desiderated goal of knowledge, until she shall have arrived at the conviction, that the Word of GOD is the only genuine philosophy.

And what is true of organization generally is equally predicable of that of speech. The race "μερόπων ἀνθρώπων" has in speech a facile channel of inter-communication, of tradition and of accumulating experiences. It may be conceded to the scientific and ingenious author of a Treatise on the "Evidence of Man's place in Nature," that the gift of speech is an endowment, that would have placed man on an eminence amongst his structural fellows, if that gift could have been rendered available. But we may hesitate to pronounce, how far that would have been effected without the Divine evocation and appliance of its aptitudes: or, how far it would have been an advantage and a distinction without a superior and intelligent actuating principle. The isolated human creature, above alluded to, would necessarily have a very limited use of that organism. His utmost available powers of making himself understood would have been little beyond the exclamations, equally conceded to the brute creation, by which to

signify pleasure, pain, or impatience. This faculty of speech, as such, is an evanescent quantity, when not awakened and assisted by intercourse; and a very questionable good, when under insentient and indiscriminating governance. The organism of the parrot and of the mocking bird is more remarkable for its approximation to the human faculty of articulation, than, in the absence of mind, for its advantage. It is an apt and an obtrusive illustration of the worthlessness of the gift of speech, not informed and directed by the true Image of the Creator. For at its highest estimate it is only an instrument and a means. It is, in its wonderful perfection as conferred on man, a vast distinction from the hand of his Creator. It is only in a very remote and qualified and constructive degree any measure of man's resemblance to GOD.

Although GOD made man structurally the fellow of the beasts that perish, in his structure little superior to the brutal Gorilla, He fashioned him in His own Divine Image as a sentient, a free and an accountable being. He gave him a measure of the Divine Intelligence. He gave him reason and memory and conscience. He gave a knowledge of His Will; and a charge to observe and to do it. He conferred upon man Divine sanctions. He concealed not from him his awful liabilities. He placed before man good and evil, upon which to exercise his free election, as a rational and accountable creature. He, the Omnipotent, in perfect accord with the nature and fitness of things and the exigencies of unalterable justice,[1] constituted the right exercise of free election man's sole approach to his Creator's approval, and his sole passport to the highest present

[1] This is Cudworth's "contingent liberty to move up and down in, without which neither rational creatures can be blameworthy for any thing they do, nor GOD have any object to display His justice upon, nor indeed be justified in His providence." Intellectual System, vol. I. p. 78.

See King's Origin of Evil, c. v. sec. 5, subsec. 1. "How evil elections are consistent with the power and goodness of GOD."

and future heavenly and angelic happiness. It is no place here to dilate on the aids and encouragements, held out, and the means, vouchsafed, to the favoured creature of the benign Creator. GOD made not this favoured creature in His own Image by fashioning him out of the dust of the ground, but by breathing into him a measure of the Divine Spirit. For GOD breathed into the nostrils of man the breath of more than one life: He breathed into man's nostrils "THE BREATH OF LIVES."[1] He breathed into man's nostrils the breath of the animal and transient life, the spiritual and the immortal life. It was the Breath, or Spirit, of GOD, that the Creator breathed into man's nostrils. And this is no theological speculation; no doctrinal mystery. No Word of GOD is meaningless. And the meaning of this word has been demonstrated and its teaching illustrated by that Seed of the woman, that bruised the serpent's head and drew the sting of disobedience; that "brought life and immortality to light" through His blessed message to fallen and sinful man.

[1] The Creator breathed into the nostrils of man "נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים," nishmath khaiim, "the breath of *lives*." The learned Bochart reads this in the dual number, "halitum vitæ duplicis," the breath of two lives; meaning the present and the future. As it is usually pointed in the plural I have taken it so. These lives must be the animal, the transient, the spiritual and the eternal life. The same plural form is used in Gen. vi. 17, because all flesh and that of man, in which are implanted lives, was to be destroyed. "The tree of life," as we read in the English Version, is really, "The Tree of lives." And one life signified is the life eternal; for the consequences of man's eating thereof would be, that he would live "לְעֹלָם," leñolam, for ever. The Septuagint renders rightly "*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*." The same property is ascribed to that "water"—S. John iv. 14—they who drink of which shall live "*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*," *for ever*. "The Spirit of GOD is in my nostrils." Job xxvii. 3. This a correct view of רוּחַ אֱלוֹהַּ, ruakh Eloah.

29. And God saith: Behold I have given to you every herb seeding seed which (*is*) upon the face of the whole earth; and every tree wherein is the fruit of a tree seeding seed; to you it shall be for food.
30. And to every beast of the earth and to every fowl of the air and to every thing creeping upon the earth, wherein (*is*) the breath of life: even every green herb for food; and it is so.
31. And God beholds every thing which He has made; and behold (*it is*) good exceedingly: and there is evening and there is morning, a sixth day.

The reader will not need to be informed that, if the above be a literal translation, it is literal even to harshness. It cannot well be otherwise, where an accurate fidelity, which may serve as a fair ground of analytic comment, and not euphony, is the object. Upon this basis an accurate and at the same time a fluent and an elegant translation may be formed by scholars, thoroughly imbued with a taste and a knowledge of the force and beauty of the genuine Anglo-Saxon tongue. Any version, which should have neglected to take our present version for its model, would be a failure. The ancient language of the children of Israel at the time of Moses, a man accomplished in all the learning of Egypt, was copious as regards diction, and infinitely susceptible of every shade of signification as regards inflection. Yet is there an intractability in its idiom, which refuses to flow readily and gracefully in the groove of modern thought and expression. I cannot divest myself of that reverence and love for the veritable Word, the ipsissima verba, of that great and good First Cause, that make its seeming peculiarities, the venerable crust of antiquity, have for me a charm and a bouquet, which is similar to, though it rises above, that affection I entertain for the exquisite

language of our own felicitous, though not always correct, translation. In saying, *not always correct,* I do not advert to unimportant verbal failures, nor the loose rendering of idiomatic phrases, but I allude to errors of a far deeper complexion; errors not few and far between in the Old, and very frequent and not seldom subversive of the writer's intention and of all sound doctrine and truth itself in the New, Covenant. Were our Version stripped of the colouring matter, thrown over it from Geneva and intensified by the Puritans in England, the followers of John Calvin, the unprincipled and ferocious destroyer of the confiding Servetus, would not find one phrase, one word, one syllable, whereon to raise his impious Babel of personal predestination and election. I have declared that my feeling in favour of the Hebrew Text rises above, and I might with all truth and propriety have said far above, that I yet strongly entertain in favour of the style and general excellence of our English Version. And justly so. Translations are the mere reflections, almost necessarily the faint reflections, and not unfrequently the distorted refractions, of derived light. The light of the sun is far other, than his light reflected by the moon; and even, well for its inhabitants, than as refracted by our earth's atmosphere. Who has need to be told, the stream is purest at the fountain's head? While, however, I am constrained by the pressure of truth to speak of our most beautiful English Version as capable of much and that most desirable improvement, its failures being much rather the consequences of untoward circumstances and infelicitous contingencies, than of any obliquity in its earliest champions, I may not preclude myself from the satisfaction of asserting its frequent superiority to every other Version, with which I have any acquaintance. Occasionally the Septuagint is happier in a rendering: occasionally the Vulgate is correct in a certain passage: very frequently Sebastian Cas-

tellio is more correct and more elegant, than any other translator: the Version of Luther has its turns of felicity. But our English Version, as a whole, and even in the point of accuracy, is most frequently the Version to be relied on; while it is unrivalled in the charms of language and all the graces of the English style in our Augustan Age. We may be excused if we indulge a measure of regret, that a book, of so eternal moment and so near to perfection, may not receive those touches, which would make it unexceptionable; would make it, without any of the harshness of an ancient train of thought and tone of delivery, in its own delicious accents the true record of Divine inspiration. A more sound state of public feeling and a more favoured age may have, we will hope, the high privilege of possessing the pure Word of GOD in all its fulness and in all its sweetness. But I must return from this digression.

The purport of this closing paragraph of the Mosaic Cosmogony is the assignment of food to man and to the inferior creatures, that GOD had created on the earth. Every seed-seeding herb and every tree, wherein is the fruit of a tree: these, apparently, are the sustenance, designed for the newly created inhabitants of the renovated globe. To eat of a tree means, of course, to eat of the fruit of that tree; only of trees bearing fruit is mention made. Of herbs the earliest use appears to have been more unreserved; both the pottage and the fruit became very early the sustenance of GOD's creatures; of the animal as its natural food in its natural state and as it was guided to eat by natural instinct; of man, as, in his present phase, an animal, though a cooking animal, whose frame no less stood in need of support. Whether the dominion, placed in his hands by his Creator, over fish, fowl and living thing be a clause, that conveys the right to kill and eat, is not to be hastily decided. We know that this right was early exercised. Arguments are not wanting in

favour of its being a right conceded. "Seeing that the custom of offering sacrifices was prior to the Deluge, so are we persuaded," writes Bochart, "was that of making use of animals as food; albeit many are of different opinion. For Abel would not have offered as a sacrifice to GOD that, which he believed it was unlawful to eat: and it would have been to no purpose for him to tend and to feed flocks, which it was not permitted him to use. '*To you it shall be for food,*' is a grant not to be referred to plants only, but also the animals, spoken of in the preceding verse."[1] It may be possible that direct and immediate permission to use the animals as food was not given, until the benediction, increase and multiply, had had time to be realized. Very early in the history of mankind the custom not only had Divine recognition, but received Divine injunctions and regulations.

This wonderful Cosmogonic sketch concludes with a repetition of the benign Creator's inspection of all His marvellous designs and operations; and the intimation that He perceives them to answer His benevolent purposes: that they are, as our Version has it excellently, "very good;" or, as the Hebrew quaintly expresses it, "good exceedingly." And the evening and the morning were the sixth day of the Creation.

RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.

In these days a recapitulation and a conclusion appear to be considered as much parts of any work, how humble soever, as the Preface, or Introduction. The reader desires to see, and the author is prone to urge under one or

[1] Bochart: Hierozoicon: Lib. 1. c. 2.

other of these forms, any further arguments and to set up any further lights, he may have to throw over his subject. In the present instance not only are these desirable as regards the reader, but indispensable as regards the author, of the foregoing literal versions and discussions. The reader has a claim to be put in possession of any further account I may be able to render of some, if not novel yet unusual, views upon the nature and the extent of the operations of Omnipotence, recorded in the Mosaic account of the Creation. And I shall be equally earnest to assert those principles, examine those operations and insist upon those results, which are to me as much a creed, proposed to my assent and acceptance by the Creator, as any part whatever of Divine revelation.

In the outset, then, I do not read, cannot descry any particle conveying the intimation, that GOD at the time indicated by the Mosaic record created the heavens and the earth out of nothing. I have shown in its proper place, from the terms employed by the inspired writer in his description of this operation, that the earth was in existence previously; and have therein proved the fallacy of a *then*[1] ex nihilo creation. I have from the same terms, used by the same inspired writer for the instruction of mankind, clearly demonstrated that at the time of the Divine operation the earth was in a condition of utter derangement and desolation, and that by that operation it was brought into order and made habitable; and therein I have placed beyond reasonable question the fact, that that act of Omnipotence was an act of simple renovation.[2] And I here take leave to record my settled conviction, that

[1] A *then* ex nihilo creation is not spoken of in the Mosaic, or any other, record, of Divine origin. When the Omnipotent shall propound His time and manner of creation, it will be man's duty to accept it.

[2] It has already had much: yet I think it cannot have too much, exegetical animadversion, and therefore I would not withhold the further light that occurs to me, respecting the cosmogonic term, applied by Moses to describe the operation of the Creator upon chaos. GOD "*prepared*" the

no man can entertain any other position, than that I have herein advanced and proved, without rashly contravening the DICTUM and the MIND of the Creator; a procedure far more irreverent towards that great and benevolent Being, than man can hope to soften and efface by any ascription of power, which HE has neither asserted nor claimed. I have greatly failed in my design, if I have not exhibited these truths in the plainest and most convincing manner. Indeed so earnest has been my desire to eradicate obvious, though deeply seated, error, that I have insisted *usque ad nauseam* upon every[1] salient point of evidence to the discountenance of it; and have not willingly omitted any opportunity of dispersing so dense a mist of delusion. The Creator, then, did not at the epoch indicated by Moses, create the world out of nothing: He did not at that time create it in the sense of bringing it into existence by the accumulation of materials from the sun, according to the theory of La Place, or from any extraneous source whatever: He is related, or in His inspired Word He relates, that He reduced, or restored, this earth, which then existed as a conglomeration of matter in confusion, to its present order and loveliness. In the beginning, that beginning intended by Moses, that beginning alluded to[2] by the Word,

existent desolation for man. This sense is well assigned by the learned Cocceius to bara, twice occurring in Ezekiel xxi. 19—24, "*prepare* thou a hand (a way, or place) in the highway to the city; *prepare*." I studiously fortify my opinions by exhibiting the agreement of the learned with those opinions.

[1] I have risked the charge of repeating myself, in my anxiety that this doctrine should be understood and accepted. They, who may not encounter the rationalia in the text, or in the notes, will see it in the conclusion, or in the preface. The antidote to the error of imagining an ex nihilo creation, *as being recorded in the Mosaic Cosmogony*, is ubiquitous. My desire has been to render this antidote, and, indeed, every part of this discussion, approachable by the reader of the most humble education and attainments; and I have postponed self in the prosecution of this object. In the present instance the recapitulation introduces the history of the false theory and its refutation on its intrinsic defects.

[2] S. Matt. xix. 8.

by Whom all things consist,[1] GOD is represented to have renovated, or re-constructed, and rendered habitable, this planet with its atmosphere.

Furthermore; this is the view taken of the act of creation by the earliest and purest ages of the world. An *ex nihilo* creation was never dreamed of by Patriarchs and Prophets, by the chosen people of GOD, or by their descendants. Mankind were little occupied, and the majority were entirely unapproachable, by the allurements of speculative fancy; and the written Word was understood and received without question and with full acquiescence. The theories of the Grecian philosophers found easy access to the unoccupied labyrinths of the human mind; the level-seeking waters not more readily found their way to the hollows of the earth. The Aristotelian doctrine of the eternity of matter appears to have been amongst the theories most acceptable to the philosophic heathens, and to have been eagerly embraced and tenaciously held amongst them. The peripatetic hypothesis of the impressibility of the human intellect was fully illustrated; where nothing was written any thing was easily inscribed. Maimonides, whom Casaubon mentions as the first of his nation who was not a trifler, and who obtained so great reputation in Egypt, as to be denominated the Egyptian Moses, was amongst the first who was moved to think upon the consequences of admitting this doctrine of the eternity of matter. A doctrine, of tendencies like those naturally and necessarily hence proceeding, fell upon the Judaic understanding with the weight of lead. Moved to pious phrenzy at the notion of aught, save alone the GOD of the Hebrews, that should be accounted eternal, he plunged into the most opposite hypothesis; an hypothesis perfectly baseless and the emanation of his own ardent and impulsive genius; that GOD created this and all the countless

[1] Col. i. 17.

globes in universal space in one moment of time and out of nothing. This theory, not so flattering to the power as questioning the veracity of the Creator, was no sooner ventilated, than it was caught up with fiery zeal by the Rabbins, and an *ex nihilo* creation became the cherished doctrine of the enthusiastic descendants of Israel. This hypothesis, opposed as it was to long received and more rational convictions as well, as to the teaching of Moses, universally prevailed. And Maimonides himself dealt no short measure of vituperation and condemnation upon the writers, who were relied upon for a sounder theory; reproaching them, such is the obliquity of human passion, as apostates from the Law of Moses. This man's zeal, aided by his reputation, which was great by his general merit and very great where merit was scarce, succeeded in recommending this doctrine not only to his own people, but to the world at large. From this world at large I must crave to have excepted as many, as were learned in, and consistent upholders of, the veritable Word of God. Nevertheless the theory of an *ex nihilo* creation obtained generally; has descended in a stream little disturbed by opposition; has been received without examination and has been handed down to the present time almost without audible question; until the public mind at the latter end of this nineteenth century recoils, and the public ear is closed, at the mention of the simple drift of that sole Record of truth, the Mosaic account of the Creation. Whether, with humble confidence I ask, is it better, to set the inquiring mind free by the admission of that light, which would justify freedom, or to force that generous and truth-loving mind to indirectness and obscure intimations of scientific convictions, by drawing close the curtain of fanatical ignorance before the open windows of heaven, and shutting off the light, that would stream through them on the inquirers after knowledge? Truth is God's

Truth. Who will be so hardy, as to throw a cloud over, or put a stumbling-block in the way of, that which is the attribute, and amongst the brightest of the jewels in the diadem, of Omnipotence? Who will dare to afford one moment's entertainment to the profane and foolish thought, that aught belonging to GOD, and of all things His Truth, will be prejudicial to His favoured creatures? Who will be so bold and so wanton, as to extinguish the taper, how humble soever, that burns as the receptacle and the vehicle of a pencil of Divine light? It is not improbable that the obscure author of these pages will be regarded askance, because he understands not the Word of GOD, as that Word has long been and is still misunderstood, but as it is written, and as alone it can be reasonably and according to the natural tenour of its language accepted. I am not indifferent to censure. It hurts me not indeed. But how can I be indifferent to that, which is the proof of my neighbour's moral and intellectual darkness? Gladly, rather, would I still the most innocuous censure by letting in light upon that darkness. I repeat, and I refer to the preceding pages for most ample and most unanswerable proofs, that an *ex nihilo* creation is not the *dictum* of the Creator. That hypothesis is a human invention. Like all human inventions it has its weaknesses. It may have in it a qualified truth: it contains an indubitable assumption. Its plea of piety, in withholding the characteristic of being eternal from every claimant save the eternal GOD alone, is specious. Piety does not presumptuously rush to an undemonstrable conclusion, which the eternal Fountain of Truth has left undeclared.

It might be worth while to inquire, whether piety, even a specious piety, be the sure and certain source of this eager anxiety to ascribe to the Deity that exercise of unquestionable Omnipotence, which in His communications to man He has no where asserted. When mankind are so

volubly loquacious about the eternity of GOD, which no sane man doubts; and of the Omnipotence of GOD, which sane man is prepared and eager to admit; when mankind obtrude upon Deity the unchallenged homage of attributing to His momentary Volition the *ex nihilo* existence of the universe; is this the homage of a sincere piety? I will put another question, which must elicit a reply. If mankind had not devised, for GOD has no where imparted, this mode of accounting for the existence of this planet and millions of globes, equal to and surpassing it, had they any other hypothesis, or theory, to put forth? I believe they had none whatever: this was, and is, their sole resource. Mankind would in that case, if they should be driven to give up their theory of an *ex nihilo* creation, be left without a notion, or even a conjecture. It would seem, then, that this mortifying ignorance, this intolerable absence of a shadow of an idea, is the source of this tribute of a spurious piety. Man would, if he had not set up this hypothesis, be driven to the admission, that his ignorance is patent and irremediable; for that his Creator had not confided to him those counsels and that knowledge, which he pants to possess. And once more he puts forth his hand to snatch from the tree of knowledge the fruit, which his GOD has withheld from him. He awaits with impatience, and he almost refuses to await, the time, whether in the present or the future stages of his existence, when he shall see GOD as He is, in all His greatness and in all His goodness, and, if it be GOD'S will so to reward his patient piety, shall be admitted to the knowledge of the time and the manner of GOD'S creation of matter. In the meanwhile, and as long as he shall remain in this nursery of his existence, he may busy himself with speculations on the forms of matter, the properties of matter, its qualities, motion, rest, equalities and inequalities, similarities and dissimilarities, identities and diversities, and all those

modes and accidents of substance, those elements and predicaments, which ages ago occupied and amused the ingenious Aristotle and his followers. The great efficient Cause man may bow himself before, but not yet see; nor penetrate any counsel He has not thought good to reveal. Knowing well that all things are of GOD, man is aware of the origin of matter; but he knows nothing more. He may take a handful of dust into his hand and may say to it, 'I am of thee; the time and the manner of my *ex humo* creation are revealed to me in GOD's holy Word. But the time and the manner of thy creation are not given me to know.'

The presumption of man has displayed itself in various ways, but never more glaringly and audaciously, than in the pretensions of the Church of Rome. I am not one of those half-informed ultra-Protestants, who are alarmed at the very name of that corrupt Church. In her I see and acknowledge much, we do well to avoid; much, we should do well to imitate. The evil of Rome's assumption and arrogance is nearly balanced and fully requited by Protestant prejudice, suspicion and detraction. The Church of Rome has done much by her arrogance to justify prudence and caution. She has shown little reverence for aught, save the authority and the traditions, she is pleased to set up and to acknowledge. That corrupt Church has not withheld her bold and sacrilegious hand from the Bible itself. What false doctrines has she not derived, what truths has she not distorted, what pretensions has she not set up! That sacred volume she makes the source of all this and much more assumption. Therein she discovers grounds of self-aggrandisement and commission to dominate, which no sober mind would recognise and no intelligent mind allow. And the Book of books, which she has set up for the basis of all her vain-glorious pretension, is the Latin Vulgate; "vulgata nostra versio!" a version

with how much soever of merit, which is yet full of errors, and is a mere compilation from the old Italic Vulgate, translated from an incorrect manuscript of the Septuagint, and the version of Jerome, which was made at the latter end of the fourth century; a Version, of which even Dupin is forced with evident reluctance to acknowledge, and a very spare acknowledgment he makes, that "our Vulgar is not consonant word for word in the same purity to the Canon of *the Hebrew Truth*, or the Divine Library of Jerome, published not long ago by Father Martinai." There is value in this praise of Dupin: not so much as regards the very faint praise of the Vulgate, as the spontaneous homage paid to the HEBREW TRUTH. The italics are not mine. They are part and parcel of the voluntary tribute of respect to the inspired original of GOD'S holy Word.

I will not spare the energy, requisite to illustrate the arrogance of the Church of Rome, in reference to the opening words of the Mosaic Cosmogony. A key-note of the tone assumed in that dealing with GOD'S holy Word will awaken us to something like a just estimate of her claims, and, it is to be hoped, a firm grasp and a fast holding of the *Hebrew Truth*. This infallible Church with her characteristic earnestness, if I write not presumption, insists that the genuine Hebrew Bible abounds in ambiguities. "There is scarcely any sentence of the Old Testament in the Hebrew Text so clear," says the Jesuit, *teste Glassio*, "that it is incapable of being translated into various and even impious significations, if the tradition and the authority of the Church be withdrawn." And again: "In order to make this plain, we will shew it by one example, the first verse of Genesis; which, perspicuous as it is according to our Vulgar Version, may be perverted in various ways, if we look to the Hebrew letter alone, without reference to the authority of the Church." This

Jesuit then rings the changes on the word, Elohim, in the first place, and therefrom deduces instances of mistranslation, which are barely possible, and are most probably of his own excogitation. And this process paves his way to the meditated damage of the true translation. Without any question the term, Elohim, is used to signify the gods of the Heathens: it may signify Angels: some have contended that it may mean princes, judges,[1] and magistrates. Our Jesuit now exhibits his logical turn for criticism by alleging that, according to the Hebrew letter any one of these several equivalents to Elohim may be set up as the Creator of the heavens and the earth; if the authority of the Church of Rome be not heard. But Elohim means also the GOD of the Hebrews, of whom and by whose Spirit Moses wrote. "It is possible," again says this Jesuit, "to translate it in such a way, as to make GOD"—and so we may suppose any one of these equivalents to Elohim—"destroy the heavens and the earth." Now this, in the form in which "*bara*" is read, is not true: though in another form, in which it is not read, it might be so.[2] The learned Glassius[3] exposes other modes of Jesuitical misrepresentation, which I pass by in hastening to investigate the criticism upon the Version, which I have been advocating and, I think, successfully. "Septima perversio. In principio renovavit Deus cœlum et terram." "A seventh perversion. In the beginning GOD renovated the heaven and the earth." "Because," says our Jesuit,

[1] See Gos. S. John x. 35, and Whitby upon it.

[2] If the verb were in the pihel, or intensive, form, it might be so. And if the authority and truthful influence of the Church of Rome were withdrawn, the word might have been read, *destroyed;* and we should be living in a ruined, instead of a renovated planet. The meaning of the simple form is to shape, or fashion, by cutting and carving. But to cut and carve intensely may be to spoil the material. A thing, intensely done, may be overdone.

[3] Philologia Sacra: Lib. 1, Tr. 3, Sec. 1.

"bara, in Ps. civ. 30, means, to renew: 'and Thou renewest the face of the earth.'" Nothing could be more Jesuitical, that is more indirect and disingenuous, than this manner of dealing with this version of the text. How did bara come to signify in a certain part of a certain Psalm, a passage that might not have occurred to any one, but this subtle reasoner, To renew? Why there in particular? Why was it not rendered, Thou createst out of nothing the face of the earth? Or, Thou whittlest to shavings and shreds the face of the earth? Simply because, as has been already shown in other places, the primary signification of the word being, to cut, to carve; and the secondary, to shape, or form by cutting and carving; and the carving into shape that which was Tohu and Bohu, out of all form, or shape, being inferentially a renewing, the verb, so applied, comes to signify, To renew, or renovate. It would have been a very singular phraseology, if Moses had written, or had used terms which could have been represented to say, God created out of nothing the earth, which existed as a chaos. But he might write, God re-created, or even created the heavens and the earth out of chaos; and if by such operation He restored them to the condition, or any thing like the condition, they were in before they were reduced to chaos; or to a condition fitted for His purposes; Moses might well say, God renovated, or re-constructed, them. God is not supposed to have renovated, restored, or re-constructed man from the dust of the ground; for that would have been an intimation of the previous existence of man: the same verb, bara, is rendered, formed, or created. God did not create man out of nothing, but from the dust of the ground. I hasten to dismiss, and feel I have encroached upon the reader's and expended my own patience in dwelling upon, these observations on the modes and tempers of the Church of Rome. It is characteristic of that Church to directly forbid the

use of the Word of GOD in the vernacular and indirectly in the original languages; to proclaim its authority and tradition, as obligatory, and indispensable to the right understanding of either the one, or the other. But who would listen to these assumptions from any authority whatever, or forego his right to the Word of GOD in his own, or in that tongue, in which GOD's inspired Servants penned it? What Church, really the Church of CHRIST, would presume, would have the un-Christian arrogance, to set up a claim, so subversive of Christian truth and Christian liberty?[1] What Church, making such pretensions, would retain a single follower, one sincere Communicant, of intelligence and genuine Christian temperament? It is no sign of Divine approbation that that Church has not yet fallen; that she is still standing, though in a tottering attitude. It would be presumption to aver that her morbid and palsied existence is a judicial sufferance.

It seems only reasonable that I should here give some reason for the undeniable distrust, with which I have re-

[1] When I maintain this Christian liberty I maintain the inalienable right, not the rational prudence, of private judgment. It is neither rational nor prudent for the most learned amongst theologians to rely upon private judgment; not even for the clergy, although they have the Divine commission to preach the Gospel. It must be pronounced most unreasonable and most imprudent, nay most presumptuous, for any private member of CHRIST'S Church to decide upon his, or her, private judgment. Private judgment is reasonable, is safe, only when, and so far as, it directs the searcher after Divine Truth to its legitimate and its sure and all-sufficient source, the blessed Word of GOD; not without hearing in a teachable spirit the documentary, in these evil days I dare only say *the documentary*, teaching of the Church of CHRIST.

If the private Christian assert his indefeasible right of private judgment, and, walking by the dim obscurity of his private taper and rejecting the light proffered by CHRIST through His Church, go astray in his private darkness, his is the error, and, alas! his are the awful consequences. He has abused his private judgment. He is a fitting object of commiseration; not for persecution. GOD help him!

garded the Septuagint Version. It would carry me too far into discussion, if I should, as I well might, sustain this distrust by an exhibition of a host, or even a great number, of failures; while the enumeration of a small number only would lay me open to the observation, that the grounds of my want of confidence are insufficient. But if I confine myself in these observations to the chapter I have been re-translating and discussing, I think there will appear errors and shortcomings in number and importance more than enough to warrant more than I have written in terms of acknowledged censure. For if in this chapter there be one, and I have already disclosed many of those momentous failures, it would only be necessary to imagine, and imagination might easily become conviction, how many exist in the several books of the Old Covenant. When one utters the word, importance, in reference to any part of holy Writ, one may well ask one's self, What can be unimportant? And hence, what error in the presentation of any part of holy Scripture can be unimportant? Although the rendering of bara by ποιέω[1] be unobjectionable, indeed perfectly in accordance with the scope of the Hebrew verb and the mind of the inspired writer, what failures, unaccountable failures! meet our eyes in the second verse! Allowing that the Greek particle, δὲ, is a better representative of the Hebrew *vau*, than the "*and*" of the English Version, or the "*und*" of Luther, what astounding misconceptions of Tohu and Bohu do we behold! misconceptions that have for centuries exposed their apologists to the necessity of proffering most absurd and puerile explanations. Not only this. This vaunted version, by some

[1] Ποιέω, poiĕō, whence poet, who composes verses out of language supplied to him; to make, to compose, to found, or build with materials at hand. The poet creates only in so far, as he erects airy castles out of airy nothings; the same being the offspring of imagination, or fancy.

considered equal and by others superior to the Divinely inspired original,[1] makes the supposititious spirit that inspired it to see Tohu and Bohu aright in one place and extravagantly otherwise in another. Again: How feebly and inadequately is the incubatory attitude of the Spirit of GOD rendered in "ἐπεφέρετο!" Similar exception may be taken to "στερέωμα," as the enunciation of rakian. The rendering by "πετεινὰ πετόμενα," as adjunct objects of the verb, "ἐξαγαγέτω," is the parent of an innumerable family of errors in versions, of futile commentaries and of officious criticism; not perhaps otherwise important, than as proofs of incapacity in the translators and affording a handle to objectors, who point to an inconsistency, which hence appears to subsist between this record and that, which in the next chapter again introduces the inferior creatures as his subjects to receive their names from the man. There are minor deviations, which may be seen in my most literal, though uncouth, translation. But far greater errors, that concern the theologian, and minor errors, if any be minor errors, obtrude themselves on the notice of the Biblical scholar. As a nation of Christians, not unknown in literature, it concerns us to see, where and how far the guide we have selected, or, rather, where the only guide we could at the time avail ourselves of, leads us from the onward and narrow track of Inspiration, in order that our own version of the Divine oracles may be not only as captivating, but more especially as correct, as our language can make it.

I shall doubtless be reminded that the version, against which I take no slight exception, was that, which was used and referred to by our blessed LORD and His Apostles. I am aware of the truth and all the force of this observation.

[1] With many of the laudators of the Septuagint Version their laudation is conjectural and, therefore, something not unlike presumption. Its fidelity with such laudators must consist of closeness to the versions, made from it, not to the sacred original.

And I should have approached with hesitating and cautious steps, or should have entirely abstained from approaching, this circumstance, had I not been ready with a most satisfactory, and that also a most reverential, response. The LORD had no alternative, but to use and refer to the Septuagint Version, or to work the untimely and unnecessary, nay even the insufficient and obstructive, miracle of suddenly reinstating the Jewish nation in the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. Not only unnecessary and inopportune would this miracle have been, inasmuch as Himself and His Apostles and the Jews generally read, spoke and thought in Greek, or the Hellenistic dialect, but insufficient and obstructive; unless He had de-nationalized the surrounding peoples by Hebraizing them, to the intent that they also, to become, or on becoming, adherents of the blessed Gospel, might hear and read the Word of GOD in that language, in which it was written by Moses and the Prophets under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of GOD.

That the Hellenized state of the Jews is undeniable may be shewn by direct testimony of profane writers and by internal evidence in the writings of the inspired Apostles themselves. The conquest of Judæa by Alexander of Macedon, who, on his return from Persia, brought back the Jews who had followed him thither and who had become Greeks in manners and language: the peopling of Samaria, whence the Samaritans had been expelled, with Macedonians: the liberation and remission by Ptolemy Philadelphus of seventy thousand Jews, who had been carried away to Egypt and compelled to use the Greek language by his father, Ptolemy Soter: the luxuriance of Hellenism and the degeneracy to foreign manners under Antiochus Magnus:[1] the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, whose *agnomen*, signifying illustrious, was changed by Polybius

[1] "ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ, καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ." 2 Macc. iv. 13.

to Epimanes, or the furious, on account of his ferocity in forcing the Greek language upon the inhabitants of Judæa:[1] these and a multitude of other circumstances contributed to establish the Greek language, manners and customs to an almost incredible extent amongst the Israelites. They retained the Chaldaic language to the time of the Maccabees; speaking amongst themselves in this, their country's, language and to foreigners in the Greek tongue: they hence acquired the reputation, and the *agnomen*, of Bilingues, or the people who spoke in two tongues. Yet it may not be forgotten that the Jews acquired the Greek language only in such sort, as to retain and blend with it many of their Hebrew words, phrases and idiomatic forms of speech; and this Judaized Greek is that dialect, which is called the Hellenistic; the dialect, in which the New Covenant is written and in which CHRIST and His Apostles spoke in their daily intercourse with the world around them and with each other. As in phraseology so in pronunciation there was the force of habit, organic as well as mental, which made the attainment of either in perfection almost impossible.[2] Few words will be required to shew

[1] See 2 Macc. vii. et seqq.

[2] In the New Testament we read, "Son of perdition;" for an abandoned character: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" for, from this mortal body: "Verily I say to you;" for, I say truth to you: "Gehenna;" for a place of pains and penalties: "Hosanna;" for, Save us: "Rabbi;" for, master: "Rabboni;" for, my master: "heaven of heavens;" for, highest heavens: and many others. Amongst these might be, although they have never been, enumerated all those metaphorical expressions, which spring from the idiomatic ellipsis of the Hebrew particle of similitude. Such are, "I am the door;" for, as it were the door: "I am the way;" for, as it were the way: "This is My Body;" for, as it were My Body: "This is My Blood;" for, as it were My Blood: and other Hebraisms, arising from the ellipsis of the ב, the particle of similitude, too recurrent to be collected within confined limits. This is no impotent argument in the hands of those, who, while they admit a real presence, do not realize a corporeal presence in the elements, when they "do this in remembrance of" their blessed Redeemer. With respect to pronunciation Josephus says,

that the Hebrews wrote in that language, which they were accustomed to speak. They were proverbially of an exclusive disposition; a separate people, who had no desire to be mixed up with other peoples. Whatever had occurred to break in upon this exclusiveness had been the result of coercion, and of policy. For themselves and their race alone they wrote. The knowledge of more, than their own, or the language they had been forced by circumstances to adopt, they accounted menial.[1] Therefore they, as a rule, wrote only in the tongue, which at the time was in general use. There is, and there need be no plainer, proof of this in the facts that the Books of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David and Solomon were written in Hebrew for the Hebrews, when that language was their vernacular: but when after the Babylonian captivity they had embraced the Chaldean dialect of the Hebrew as their medium of oral communication, then were the very Books of the Law written in the Chaldaic, instead of the original Hebrew, characters; parts of Jeremiah, of Daniel and of Ezra in the Chaldaic dialect; and Chaldaic words frequently introduced. The same course was adhered to, when Hellenistic had become their familiar language. Into this language first[2] by the Seventy and subsequently by Aquila, Symmachus and by Theodotion the Books of the Old Testament, more or less, were translated, and in the same

"*τὴν δὲ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβειαν πάτριος ἐκώλυσε συνήθεια.*" Antiq. lib. 20, c. 10, § *β*.

[1] — "*παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλῶν ἐθνῶν διάλεκτον ἐκμαθόντας, διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι νομίζειν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα τοῦτο οὐκ ἐλευθέρων μόνον τοῖς τυχοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν τοῖς θέλουσιν.*" κ.τ.λ. Idem. Ibidem.

[2] I say "first," not deeming it necessary to allude to the assertions of S. Clement of Alexandria in his Stromata, or of Eusebius in the ninth book of his Evangelical Preparations, that there was a version of the Law before that of the Septuagint. It is also said that Plato, Pythagoras and Aristotle had translated "diverse things out of the Books of Moses." See Dupin: Complete History of the Canon of Old and New Testament.

dialect all new books were written; whether by Philo, Jesus the son of Sirach, or other writers about the time of the Maccabees. Did I not fear that I am dilating beyond measure and proportion on this topic I could put forward an abundance of evidence, that the Hebrews spoke, wrote, stamped their coin, named places and persons and educated their children in the Hellenistic dialect.[1] They submitted to surgical treatment, in order to obliterate, if possible, the vestiges of the distinguishing rite of Judaism.

From these premises it is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion, that our LORD and His holy Apostles spoke the Hellenistic dialect. The name, taken by the Redeemer, might suffice to establish this point. He assumed the Office, not the name, of Messiah, or *Mashiakh;* preferring the Greek equivalent, Christus: and His followers were called Christians, and not by any modification of the Hebrew term. Again: CHRIST called His chosen Twelve by the Greek derivative, meaning *sent,* Apostles: He changed the Hebrew name *Cephas* to *Peter,* the Greek equivalent.[2] Our blessed LORD also used the Greek Version of the Old Testament by the Seventy; as may be seen by comparing the passage,[3] selected from Isaiah and recorded by S. Luke.[4] It may be matter of reverent conjecture, whether the redundant clause, "ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει," be a right of addition asserted by the Incarnate Word, or whether, as some suppose, it has

[1] Any one desirous of fuller information will find it in the work of Dom. Diodati, "De Christo Græcè loquente." This ingenious and learned book was soon out of print, although it first appeared as lately as 1767. Dr. Hug, the author of the best Introduction to the writings of the New Testament, could not find a copy. It is not in the library of the British Museum. Bennet and Lowndes had it not in their catalogues. But a copy was in the library of the celebrated scholar, Dr. Parr. It was reprinted at London in 1843. See Editor's Preface.

[2] Cephas, Κηφᾶς: from the Syro-Chaldaic ܟܐܦܐ, which from the Hebrew, כֵּף, a rock, or stone. See Schleusner. Lex. N. T.

[3] Chap. lxi. 1. [4] Chap. iv. 18.

crept into the text from the margin.[1] These words are seen in no manuscript; nor does either Ambrosius or Eusebius appear to have read them. It would exceed my limits were I to add more, than that the adoption of the Septuagint Version by The CHRIST is a recurrent circumstance. He also made use of the Greek proverbs. "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one iota, or one tittle, shall by no means pass away from the Law, until all things come to pass." It is true that the iota is the smallest of the Greek letters. But it is not so small as the Hebrew yod, or the Syriac Yud.[2] When, therefore, our LORD desired to illustrate His meaning by a letter, or a tittle; the least that occurred to Him, and would familiarly occur to His hearers, was the iota, or smallest letter in the Greek alphabet. And this could only be, because the Greek alphabet and Greek adages were the most familiar to Himself and to those, who heard Him. For the same reason He did not say, I am Aleph and Thav, or, I am Olaph and Thav: but, I am Alpha and Omega; the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet.[3]

And what may be said of their Divine Master may with equal truthfulness be said of His holy Apostles. Their

[1] This interpolation, if an interpolation, must have taken place very early. The Alexandrian and the Vatican copies have it in the text. The Syriac New Testament has it also. The Syriac MS. from the Monastery of Sta. Maria Deipara, in the valley of the Natron Lakes, discovered by Archdeacon Tattam, and edited by Dr. Cureton, being defective from the middle of the third to the thirty-fourth verse of the seventh chapter, bears no witness. The Sinaitic New Testament has it textually.

[2] The Greek iota, ι; the Hebrew yod, י; the Syriac yud, ܝ. A look at these will clinch the argument.

[3] The allusion of the SAVIOUR to the miracle of Jonah is another instance of His familiarity with the Septuagint. That Version makes the "large fish" of the Hebrew into "*a whale*." As a whale CHRIST alludes to it.

This miracle is rejected by the sceptic and accepted with difficulty by the vulgar. They allege the narrow gullet of that animal. As if the Creator of the whale could not create a whale with a swallow adapted to His purpose! But "*a great fish*" is the Scriptural expression.

habit of consulting the Septuagint Version was a matter of necessity. The gift of tongues had not yet descended upon them; and they read not the Hebrew original. The Greek Version was, in their and the hands of those they addressed, the only one they understood. But their own style of writing was a different one from the Hellenistic of the Septuagint. The contact with, and the ascendancy of, the Romans are perceptible in their language; it has Latinisms and other evidences of familiarity with the Roman conquerors and of a later age.

From the slight sketch I have traced in the foregoing paragraphs it may be well conceived, that the use of the Septuagint Version was a matter of necessity and even policy, not of choice, by our LORD and His Apostles. They were, if with utmost deference I may say it, restrained to that version by their personal, and the circumstances of those, whom they addressed. To think of the Septuagint Version as an inspired or as a Divinely preferred work is a perpetuation of the folly of Aristæus, and an erection of a superstructure of puerile conceits upon a fable and an imposition.[1] It was, as is every translation, a merely human operation, bearing in its history and in its texture an endless tissue of human error and human inconsistency. In this honest and just estimate of this version I have no desire to withhold my acknowledgments of its merits and of its felicitous consequences. We can never come to a true notion of GOD's ancient, and that His only genuine, Word from the Septuagint Version: without it, had it never been made, we might, in the torpor of Hebrew literature through many ages, be yet without any vernacular translation whatever of the elder covenant of GOD with man.

[1] For an account of the fabulous relation of the circumstances, under which the Septuagint Version was made, see Dupin, Complete Canon of the Old and New Testaments. Ch. 6, sec. 2.

Having removed this obstruction *in limine* I may now proceed with my review of the aspect, in which it has seemed to me most consonant with the truth to regard the Mosaic account of the renovation of the heavens and the earth; or, as it is usual to designate it, the Mosaic Cosmogony. And the motives to this review are neither slight, nor unimportant. For upon its consistency, and its bearing examination, entirely depends whether that aspect be the true, or an eccentric and fanciful, one. The general, I might have suffered my pen to write the universal, perplexity, which prevails with respect to the scope of the Mosaic Record; the embarrassment occasioned by this perplexity to scientific inquiry; the confusion arising from apparent inconsistencies between the Word and the works of GOD; the errors in translations and the absurdities, which those errors originate; these several strongly motive actualities imperatively demand investigation of the probable mind of the Holy Spirit of GOD in that Record; and are no mute apologists for any attempt, how humble soever, to reconcile—not GOD's holy Word with human philosophy, but—GOD's written Word with His manifest Works. This globe, the Solar System, the universe are the works, the Book of the works of GOD; written by the finger of the Omnipotent Creator, not dictated in language to an inspired writer. Never proceeded from the lips of man even in this enlightened age, a more truthful sentence, than that, uttered by the able Bishop of Oxford in his recent Charge: "Nature is certainly as much the Voice of GOD as Revelation." It will not be without some degree of censure from elegant rather, than correct,—from enthusiastic rather, than judicious, readers, that I shall be favoured, when I declare that a considerable amount of the mist, that hangs over the Mosaic Cosmogony, proceeds from the laboured grandeur of effect, that is given in translation to the simple, yet most pregnant, terms, in which

that Record is written. With a felicity that was intensely studied and laboured in its attainment and forced in its sustentation, the Seventy have chosen to represent the terms of omni-efficient Volition as a command throughout rather than a decree. The *fiat* in the admission of light is indeed a rare and standard instance of the sublime in style. But it was not the only, nor the necessary, view of the language of the original. At the utmost it is the barely admissible rendering of the words of the holy Prophet. Sublime conceptions and elegant language are charms, which no human being with any, the very least, pretension to understanding and taste can disregard. So far from undervaluing these things the writer of these pages cultivates them with more avidity, than success. He would feel no small gratification, if he could speak of the momentous matters he treats of with becoming phrase and diction; he would receive no slight consolation, if he could recommend those awful subjects in the smallest degree by the allurements of a graceful style. But there is another, and that a still more essential, characteristic of a good style; a characteristic, which intelligence will not, and taste may not, overlook, or neglect. And that characteristic is, in original writing, Truth; in translation, Fidelity. Withdraw truth from any record, or fidelity from any transcript of a record, and elegance, refinement and sublimity sink to mere romance; or, if not positively fiction, become disguised and perplexed and inextricable truth. This is the case with the Mosaic Cosmogony. Sublimity of style and the graces of composition have been more the objects of the translators, than fidelity; or than that perspicuity, which conduces to the apprehension of truth.

But this allegation, unsupported by evidence, would go for nothing. Let us, then, briefly proceed to a more circumstantial consideration of this position. We have already paid the homage of admiration to the sublimity of

the Septuagint Version in its inimitable "*Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς:*" a rendering which has been allowed, inasmuch as, which has been conceded in the proper place, the future tense may by a grammatical canon, set up for the occasion, be taken and rendered as an imperative mood. The same rendering of the same Hebrew form with, of course, similar allowance occurs with reference to the expanse: "*Γενηθήτω στερέωμα.*" But a bold freedom is asserted in the matter of the collection of waters. There we read a present, or future, objective, which would naturally be rendered, the waters are, or, shall be, gathered together. But the Seventy tenaciously hold on to the imperative mood: "*συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ;*" E. V., "Let the waters be gathered together." Indeed by virtue of the precedent themselves have set up, importing a Greek idiom into sacred Hebrew literature, they convert every future tense to an imperative form of speech; whether there exist a shadow of a plea for it, or not. Their one brilliant success chains them to this indulgence. When I write *indulgence,* I feel conscious that *licence* would have been a better term for the assumption. For if by canons,[1] made to suit a liberty, that liberty be countenanced; that liberty, so cushioned, is yet a licence. It is a Greek usage arbitrarily forced upon Hebrew simplicity. In no case, not even in that much lauded passage, "Let there be light," is it consonant with the Hebrew terms, or the Hebrew writer's intention: the future would be more naturally rendered as a future, and would be preferable as regards perspicuity: moreover, it would not be a first step in a wrong direction.[2]

[1] Such is the case, as I have already shewn in a note upon the "*places of light,*" when a verb has for its third radical a quiescent ה: Lee's Heb. Gram. art. 119, 9; or when the paragogic ה, or the epenthetic ן "seem to indicate commands, prohibitions, or exhortations." Artt. 233, 234, 235.

[2] I am aware of the opposition this doctrine will evoke. I entertain no misgiving upon it. Hebrew grammar has been made almost entirely, and actually so in these and similar instances, to account for the views of the Seventy.

But if this be, and it cannot reasonably be denied that it is, the case with future tenses, rendered as imperatives after a Greek idiom, allowed by canons that have been framed to meet this licence, where shall I find words to mark this practice, when extended to præterites? If this be barely allowable in the example, "*Γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες,*" "Let there be places of light," it cannot but seem extravagantly licentious to assign the same form of translation to a præterite tense[1] in a connected member of the same sentence: "*καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς σημεῖα,*" "and let them be for signs:" and further the same licence is carried out to as great an extreme, when the same præterite at the commencement of the fifteenth verse is rendered, "*καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς φαῦσιν,*" "and let them be for lights." Now in the Hebrew original, the ipsissima Dei verba, these verbs are in past tenses, or times: and they record the previous being of these places of light. We need not to be reminded that a mandate is most naturally uttered in the imperative mood. And yet in this record of the earth's regeneration there occurs no imperative, except in those repeated injunctions, "Be fruitful and multiply," &c. We might therein be trained to regard those futures not as mandates, but as decrees of such things, as should by Divine Volition take place; and much more should we cease to look upon the præterites as mandates; and learn to think of them as Divine records of things that have been. It might suit the artful designs of a greedy and unscrupulous invader to amaze the children of nature by the prediction of an eclipse: there is no room for the

[1] If it be allowed to render וְיִהְיוּ מְאוֹרֹת by "*Γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες,*" and it is only *allowable*, the allowance does not extend to the preterite, וַיְהִי. The conjunction prefixed to this præterite is illative, not copulative. It signifies *moreover*, or even as, since, seeing that, inasmuch as. Or, if it be taken as a *copula*, it connects and gives continuity to the sentence, introducing the apodosis.

thought that the Creator intended His decrees to take the nature of a prophecy and so to display His Omniscience to the host of heaven, before man was created. The fact may, and needs, not be ignored that prophecies are frequently couched in a præterite tense, thence denominated the prophetic future; because it intimates that the thing prophesied shall as surely come to pass, as if it had already happened. Yet to seize every opportunity to represent prophetically, or imperatively, both that, which is announced as a decree, and that, which records a matter of history, is a looseness of translation, we should not do wisely to countenance, much less to imitate, in any, and especially in a sacred, document. In the twenty-sixth verse however, our venerable Version not only imitates, but outstrips, the Septuagint in this extravagance. In the sacred original God is represented to say, "We will make man." And the Septuagint as a matter of necessity as well, as propriety, renders the Hebrew by a Greek future, "ποιήσωμεν." But the English Version, enamoured of its *catena* of imperatives, adopted in other cases from the Septuagint Version, exceeds that Version by a further indulgence of a too much commended caprice; if, indeed, it do not aim at a sublimity of its own in its "Let us make man." The apology for the English, and other modern Versions, lies in the fact, the incontrovertible fact, that they were all dependent upon the Septuagint; or upon the Latin Vulgate, a servile translation of the Septuagint. The apology for the Seventy may be that, they had not too much Greek, but less of Hebrew, learning. Some writer, I think it is Dupin, questions the probability that seventy-two Jews, who were capable of translating the Hebrew Bible into any language, could be found at the time; and denies the probability that each tribe could supply six persons able to perform the operation. "Assuredly," the same writer adds,[1] "a

[1] And that writer is the learned and indefatigable Dupin.

smaller number might have succeeded in executing the task, if they were fitted to undertake it." I have a notion which frequently obtrudes itself and is not always so easily put aside, that the Seventy Jews had aid and support from more cultivated and elegant Greek scholars, in the formation of the Greek Text. Ptolemy desired more books. If they were exquisite specimens of manu-scripture, and of polite literature, they were additions to his library.

The errors I have exposed in this first chapter of Genesis, errors that must have proceeded from ignorance as well as from presumption, must satisfy the reader that the Septuagint Version has no pretension to have been an inspired operation; and that the exceptions I have taken against its fidelity, or correctness, are only too well founded. There is an infinity of lesser, or merely literary, errors. One or two places occur to me of greater consideration. I produce them.

Let us take a cursory glance at the vexed passage in the Book of Job, where the patient man's wife is introduced, saying to him, "Barek Elohim vamuth."[1]

This clause the Vulgate, Seb. Castellio and Luther render, "Bless God and die."[2] But the English Version reads, "Curse God and die." And what solution of Hebrew Truth do the Seventy propose? Their solution, or obfuscation, of this text is, "Say some word to the Lord and die."[3] Is this "some word," or "a certain word," a suggestion in the spirit of the English Version? The verb in question signifies, to bless: other verbs are at hand—when to curse, is intended.[4] The whole stream of

[1] בָּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים וָמֻת. c. 2, v. 9.

[2] "Benedic Deo et morere." Vulgate. "Age sane Deo gratias, et morere." Seb. Castellio. "Ja, segne Gott und stirb." Luther.

[3] "ἀλλὰ εἰπόν τι ῥῆμα εἰς Κύριον καὶ τελεύτα."

[4] When Isaiah writes (viii. 21), "they shall fret themselves, and curse their King and their God"—the verb is kalal. וְקִלַּל בְּמַלְכּוֹ וּבֵאלֹהָיו, vekillēl bemalko ubēlohāv. When Moses writes, "Thou shalt not curse God"—

significations and applications of the verb, barak, flows on through Holy Writ in one uninterrupted course of—towards GOD—invocation, adoration, blessing; and these on bended knees: from GOD to man, of blessing and making prosperous: and from man to his fellow, of benevolence, of benediction and of beneficence. Its primary meaning is, to kneel. Its Arabic derivative represents the attitude taken by the camel, when that meek and enduring animal receives its burthen.[1] The solution of the *nodus* in our text is sometimes sought in the import of the word, Elohim. Professor Lee, in his most elaborate treatment of the Book of righteous Job, has rendered this place, "Bless the Gods and die;" meaning, end thy sufferings by voluntarily incurring death under the Patriarchal Law. This, however, does not articulate with the taunts[2] of Satan in the fifth verse of this, and in the eleventh verse of the pre-

E. V., "revile the Gods"—the verb is not barak, but kalal. אֱלֹהִים לֹא תְקַלֵּל, Elohim lo tekallēl. And when Job intended to curse his day, the verb is not barak, but kalal. "After that Job opened his mouth, and he curses his day." וַיְקַלֵּל אֶת־יוֹמוֹ. When, however, Jezebel charged the nobles to set up sons of Belial, who should bring an accusation against Naboth, that should render him liable to capital punishment, the verb to be used was barak. The accusation was, "Thou didst bless GOD and the King." The crime, alleged, was that of ascribing to the King and to GOD, *conjointly*, worship, which belonged to GOD alone. The Septuagint, the Vulgate and Luther render the place correctly; the English Version and Castellio incorrectly. The three former give the sense of blessing; the two latter of malediction. Is it probable that the Seventy saw the passage in the aspect of, blessing, or cursing, "the gods," *the false gods*, and forbore a, seemingly to them, literal translation from motives of fear of, or obsequiousness to, Ptolemy?

[1] By the use of this verb, and its derivative, Solomon is represented to have "*kneeled* down upon his *knees* before all the congregation of Israel." 2 Chron. vi. 13; by the same verb and derivative Daniel "*kneeled* upon his *knees* and prayed." Dan. vi. 10, E. V.; vi. 11, Heb.

[2] Professor Lee has his view of these taunts of Satan. As if it read: "But put forth Thy hand now and touch all that he hath"—otherwise, if Thou do not this thing—"if not, he will bless Thee to Thy face."

Schultens may be consulted on this passage, and the Book of Job generally, with profit and delight.

ceding chapter. There we read not Elohim, but the pronoun of the second person. And the person addressed being the one true GOD, Elohim, both in the passage under discussion and in the fifth verse of the preceding chapter, can alone signify the eternal GOD Himself. The manner of the application of the verb, barak, must, therefore, supply the desiderated solution. And in the search for that solution it will be at once seen and felt that an Euphemism lurks beneath that expression of blessing. We discover a harsh resolution, a daring sentiment, couched in phrase gentle and delicate. It is a bidding, farewell, as an intimation of renouncement. It is "χαίρειν φράσαι," "πολλὰ χαίρειν ἐᾶν;" simply importing, farewell, I renounce—the thing, or person addressed, or spoken of.

"καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοραῖς καταξιῶ." Agam. 581.

With this euphemism of Æschylus, "I think right to bid farewell to misfortunes," that of Virgil,

—— "Vivite, Sylvæ!" Ecl. 8, 58.

consents. It was, then, a fatal renunciation of GOD, that Job feared for his sons. It was an impious renunciation, that Satan scornfully suggested:—"if he do not bless," meaning renounce, "Thee to Thy face." It seems, also, that it was this sad renunciation, that the weak wife of the righteous Job counselled; or has been understood to counsel. But all lay under the Euphemism of blessing. The taunt of Satan was unmitigated and unmitigable. The "may be my sons have blessed," in the sense of forsaken, "GOD in their hearts," of Job was rather a matter of anxiety, than of persuasion, or even of suspicion. It would be a source of sincere and deep self-gratulation, if I could represent this counsel of a wife to a sorely afflicted husband in a more favourable light, than that, in which it is usually regarded. That her words breathed impatience there can be no question. For else had not the righteous man re-

proved her want of wisdom: that she was weak was the extent of his censure. That censure scarcely agrees with a notion of the more serious delinquency. Is the charge of a graver nature inevitable? Were these words never used in their legitimate sense? When Wolsey bade

"A long farewell to all his greatness,"

we can well conceive that his exclamation was not uttered in a feeling of contempt for the good things of this world, nor even of contentment to be stripped of them. Did the frail wife of the righteous Job exhort her husband to perceive that GOD had forsaken him, and that instead of "*strengthening*"[1] himself in his "*uprightness*," he should bid farewell, and even bless, though he should succumb to, the hand, that lay so heavily upon him?

I vouch not for this any thing but impossible reading of this long debated and ill understood place of Holy Scripture. It is a reading that would be less untrue to woman's character and to man's experience.

The treatment by the Seventy of the passage in Exodus, whence translators[2] have been led to represent the GOD of forbearance and love as hardening the heart of Pharaoh, may not be overlooked. The good and gracious GOD never hardened, is not represented in the Hebrew Truth as having hardened, Pharaoh's heart. He only declares the miserable condition of that monarch's heart through his own pride and obstinacy. The intensive form, or voice, of the Hebrew verbs have this amongst their various powers of expression.[3] The phrase, "I will harden his heart," is

[1] Or, the legitimate rendering might be, "Dost thou yet strengthen, or confirm, thyself in thy uprightness, blessing GOD and dying?"

[2] It has had this influence on the Vulgate, Luther, Castellio and the English Version.

[3] For the satisfaction of the non-Hebraist it may be well to give some concise *rationale* of the Hebrew conjugations, or voices. The first form of

a fair equivalent of the Seventy's, "ἐγὼ δὲ σκληρυνῶ[1] τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ." But this is not by any intelligible means an equivalent to the Hebrew, "וַאֲנִי אַחֲזִק אֶת־לִבּוֹ," văĕnī ĕkhăzzēk ĕth-libbō. The verb ekhazzek, an intensive form of חָזַק, khāzak, he became obdurate, unyielding, signifies, He declared something obdurate; He pronounced something hard and unyielding: the something pronounced hard in this instance was the heart, that was the disposition, of Pharaoh. Without entering into a discussion of this matter, which would carry me beyond the limits I propose to myself, it may be sufficient to bring forward another case, where the consequence of accepting a precisely similar expression in the same manner would involve a self-evident absurdity. In Leviticus,[2] the Priest would make unclean, and[3] would make clean, the lepers presented for his official inspection and judgment; and, moreover, in the last versicle of that chapter would make clean, or unclean, the linen, or woollen, garments; if we should deal with the

the Hebrew verb, kal, or light, is the active voice; I break. The next conjugation, or voice, is passive, or objective; I am broken. The third voice is *intensitive*, Professor Lee's term, I break to atoms. The fourth voice is the passive of the third; I am broken to atoms. The fifth voice is causative; I cause another to break something. The sixth voice is passive of the fifth; I am caused to break something. A seventh voice is the middle: the reflective voice of the Greek language; I break myself. The third voice has, moreover, the force of, I declare, I pronounce, broken: and also the fifth.

[1] The exhibitive, or declarative expression of the third and fifth Hebrew voices is allowed universally. But the transfer of the same expression to Greek verbs in *άζω*, *ίζω*, *εύω*, *ύνω*, *άνω*, *άω*, *έω*, *όω*, as Professor Lee would rule, is neither understood, nor permissible. The authors of the Latin Vulgate, Castellio, Luther and our own translators, were conspicuously unacquainted with it. Scapula's and other Greek Lexicons make *σκληρύνω* to signify, To render hard, to harden: not to pronounce hard. Winer also, Vol. I. p. 104, teaches that, verbs in *ύνω* signify to render what the concrete root denotes. My memory supplies me with no such usage of these verbs by pure Greek writers, as would be hereby imposed.

[2] Chap. xiii., verses 3, 8, 15, 22, 25, 27, 30, 44, et alibi.

[3] Ibid. verses 6, 13, 23, 28, 34, 37.

Hebrew intensive verb in those places, as the Seventy have dealt with the intensive form of the Hebrew verb, to harden; and as all translations within my reach have dealt with it. In another place,[1] the same form of another Hebrew verb has either the primary intensive, or the declarative, manner of expression. For there the action of the verb is by the possessors, as agents, on their own hearts. And the full force would be, "Wherefore do ye intensely harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh intensely hardened their hearts?" Here the agent is not GOD; and the action may be intense, exhibitive, or declarative, by the agents, or owners, of the dispositions so hardened. They may intensely harden their hearts; they may prove them hardened; they may declare them hardened. Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture. In Exodus, c. viii. v. 11, and in the last verse of that same chapter we read, who it was that hardened Pharaoh's heart. It was not his benign Creator, who, on the contrary, was exerting His wondrous power to afford him another and yet another opportunity of voluntarily relenting, but the intractable Pharaoh himself. "When Pharaoh saw there was *a breathing time* so as to harden his heart, he hearkened not unto them; as the LORD had said." And again in the last verse: "And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, and he would not let the people go." I have taken some little pains to set this matter in the true light, in order to reconcile the whole of this, and all other similarly constructed and similarly misunderstood places of Holy Writ, with due notions of the justice and goodness of GOD. As this matter has stood, preachers of the Gospel of CHRIST have had recourse to various expedients. Your Calvinist takes little trouble about it. He merely fixes his eyes on his deluded hearers and points to "*the vessel of wrath.*" More enlightened and more scrupulous,

[1] 1 Sam. vi. 6.

in these days less followed, preachers regard and represent God's hardening Pharaoh's heart, as a judicial visitation of his contumacy towards His holy Prophet. All this darkness arises from the error, the lamentable ignorance, or negligence, of the Septuagint Version. The softened charge of obscurity is scarcely possible, if my argument against the hypothetic expression of σκληρύνω be, as it claims to be, admitted. S. Paul's use of this verb[1] is of a different complexion. If interpreted in all its severity even against the temporal condition of peoples, it would be harsh in the extreme. But it was merely intended to convey the idea of greater, or less, consideration; even as the hating of Esau only signifies the preference of the seed of Jacob, as the depositaries of God's oracles for the behoof of all mankind; even as the expression, to hate father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters and his own life also, as the duty and badge of a disciple of Christ, only intends the postponement of all worldly affections to the love and service of God through Jesus, The Christ.

It may not be imagined that there are not very many important and innumerable merely literary errors, besides these I have put forward, in the Version of the Seventy.[2] I might extend this discussion, already beyond calculation extended, from a pamphlet to a folio, were I to enter upon any thing like a detail of errors. To the reader, who turns with distaste from the only road to this conviction; from

[1] Ep. Rom. ix. 18.

[2] In the matter of "*Shiloh*," Gen. xlix. 10, the Septuagint is correct, while all other versions, the English Version amongst the rest, are incorrect. The Septuagint has, "τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ;" the error has crept in through a false lection of the Hebrew text about the tenth century of the Christian era. It stood in older MSS., "*asher lo*," אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, which was first corrupted to "*shello*," שֶׁלּוֹ, and then amended, or attempted to be amended, to "*shiloh*," שִׁילֹה. The "ᾧ ἀπόκειται" of Symmachus and Aquila is superior to the "τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ" of the Seventy.

the most satisfactory and the most delightful source of Biblical and philosophical knowledge, the study of that most wonderful volume in its own sacred and interesting language, I can offer no substitute. He must receive on trust, and, if he be a minister of CHRIST,[1] he must teach on trust, those awful and momentous subjects, which he might draw and might distribute from the Fountain of Truth. And have I not shown with too much certainty that he is not always in the hands of the safest guides? We have only to look at the faults and discrepancies amongst translations, and we shall be convinced of, and keenly feel, this truth. Without reference to the sacred original, the ipsissima Dei Verba, the Hebrew Truth, no

[1] It is matter of astonishment to all thinking, and of regret to all earnest people, that persons, who are entirely devoid of acquaintance with the original language of the Old Testament, should venture, or be admitted, into Holy Orders. The Ministers of the Gospel are compelled to appeal to those ancient Books, as the records of GOD'S dealings with His chosen people and as the storehouse of prophecies relating to the Divine Author of the Gospel Covenant. And they can only know these important matters imperfectly, through the Septuagint and its offspring, the Latin and the English Vulgates. It would really be a very inconsiderable effort to obtain a respectable and useful mastery of the Hebrew tongue. But were it an arduous undertaking, it might be confidently proposed to British youths, who aspire to the high and holy office of becoming ambassadors of CHRIST.

It would indeed be well for CHRIST'S Church and for the members, who compose it, if something beyond the usual slender modicum of Greek, enabling the student to make out with some difficulty and with small intelligence a chapter of the New Testament, were demanded of candidates for the highest and most sacred office man can hold. Greater proficiency in the Greek and some respectable knowledge of the Hebrew languages, and ascertained aptness in applying that proficiency and that respectable knowledge to the elucidation of the Holy Scriptures, should constitute the high road to Ecclesiastical prizes; not political partizanship, nor blind nepotism. I regard with ineffable indignation the *raids* that have been made upon Episcopal and Capitular properties. The Dignitaries must, nevertheless, "provide for their own households" out of their diminished incomes, without defrauding industry and talent of their merited and due reward. The Clergy are men of superior, not of superhuman, aspirations.

man can pretend to any criterion, any available standard, of fidelity. Truly he has abundance of information for all spiritual purposes, all things necessary to salvation; but he has no unfailing source of truth, of literary, or of refined, satisfaction.[1] He sits under the light of the pale moon: the brightest beams and the warmest rays of the Sun of Inspiration cannot reach him.

After all I have said, relating to the inadequacy of our English, and all other Versions, it might be reasonably demanded that I give some model of what I consider a Version should be. Yet, reasonable as this demand appears, the response to it must naturally impress me strongly with the arduousness of the undertaking and with my incompetency to the work. It requires a very cultivated ear, a perfect facility in the English idiom and a discriminating taste for the native beauty of the Anglo-Saxon element, contained in it. It is no pretence for me to confess that I am conscious I do not possess these desirable, and to this undertaking most indispensable, accomplishments. These tastes are far too rarely cultivated, considering their importance in every point of view; and especially to the Clergy, who would therein find a chord of powerful sympathy between the preachers and the congregation, addressed from the pulpit. It would be a circumstance that

[1] The most accomplished Greek scholar, who is entirely devoid of skill in the Hebrew literature, is unable to read the Hellenistic of the New Testament with full relish and profit. The Hellenistic of the New Testament is Greek abounding in Hebraisms. I have smiled at the boast of a distinguished University Classic, that he "could read the Greek Testament as well, as a Bishop." So he, undoubtedly, could, if the Bishop were guiltless of Hebrew literature: otherwise, not.

would cause every fibre to vibrate and would reach the heart through the best affections, if the people should in their own language, in which they were born, hear of the gracious designs and the wonderful works of GOD. But even to the ripe scholar, thus fitted for popular addresses, or for interpretation of the original Word of GOD, the task, especially the latter, is one of infinite delicacy, and that demands a lively and untiring vigilance. The ear may find a charm in a word, or a phrase, that does not accurately satisfy the original, and thus the taste and the judgment may be antagonistic; the selection from two, or more, solutions may distract the most scrupulous attention; the expression, that most closely enunciates the mind of the inspired Writer, may not be calculated to awaken the corresponding idea in the mind of the reader. The grandeur, the solemnity, the tenderness of the subject must be perceived and felt, without apparent effort of the interpreter, in the march and the tone of the interpretation. Force must not be rigid; ease must not have the appearance of indifference; simplicity must not sink to slipshod; smoothness must not cloy; fulness must not surfeit. The rare felicity is, to cull the simple phrase that suits the great occasion.[1] There occur many such felicities in our English Version. Unless I should be compelled, I would not violate by a retouch those sacred relics of our ancient style; lest I be found to offend against GOD's holy Truth in its fairest guise. If there be ambiguous terms, phrases, members of sentences, or entire sentences, how may these be dealt with? I am aware of a manner of entertaining these, to which I can scarcely bring myself to subscribe. That is, to interpret ambiguously ambiguous passages. But the terms are at variance.

[1] Passages, that are not emphatic in the original, have no claim to be emphatic in the translation. Le Clerc points to this fault as frequent; and he censures it. Artis Criticæ P. ii. cap. iv. reg. 3.

How can ambiguity perform the office of interpretation? I dismiss the distinction between translation and interpretation, as a mere affair of words. Both mean a removal of a mind from one into another language; or, into other terms of the same language.[1] It is difficult to imagine any part of GOD'S holy Revelation so obscure, that its verbal signification, I say verbal to distinguish between language in its simple acceptation and prophetic language, may not be approached, if not arrived at. Even if that signification should seem latent in ancient phrase, or obscure diction, that passage does not, like the Sphinx's Enigma, stand alone. There is other matter, which must be brought into contact with it; and the hopeful probability is, that the comparison, or blending, of these may result in a precipitation of the truth. And if otherwise, the fault will be with the reader rather, than with holy Scripture. There will be a manifest want of due preparation; a short-coming in reading and intelligent digestion; a neglect in seeking truth, or seeking it aright; not the fact that truth is beyond reach. The Volume of GOD'S Word is a Volume of marvels. It cannot be grasped by the most vigorous intellect in the life of man; successive lives of ablest commentators have not yet opened all its pages. The handling of it according to a man's moral and intellectual strength is the passport to a future, that will open the

[1] In our venerable Version are many excellent and graceful interpretations; while in many passages the meaning is obscure through a fastidious adherence to words. The reader, who shall have his mind awakened to this fact, will not rarely perceive the justice of the observation. The mind of the inspired writer must be reached through his words. But his words alone, how accurately soever rendered, will not suffice, if they do not convey that ascertained mind to the reader. The scope of the phrases and words in the language, into which the translation is being made, must be weighed; and rejected, or adopted, as they be suitable, or otherwise. It would be no difficult operation, if we should essay to exhibit passages in our Version, in which freedoms are unscrupulously taken; and others in which the mind of the inspired writer is missed and lost through an undue and ill-timed scrupulousness. This is "*verba dare.*"

precious Volume more widely and more satisfactorily to the eye of his understanding. But after all, should there occur a passage, of which the sense seems unattainable, the only treatment I could recommend, or would adopt, would be that of a literal *verbatim* translation. The words written by the inspired Writer should live and breathe there as nearly, as language could represent them; they are the words, or they are rich with the mind, of the HOLY SPIRIT, who will open their intent in His good time.

No undertaking should be entered upon without humblest prayer to the Divine Source of all good and desirable issues. Let the undertaking of the new Translation, or, rather, of the revision of our Translation, of GOD'S blessed Word be made only after prayer for the guidance of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT. In this feeling and with this preliminary act I respond to the reasonable, or reasonably assumed, expectation of the reader.

A LITERAL AND A READABLE TRANSLATION OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

Literal Translation.	*Amended Translation.*
1. In the beginning GOD restored to order the heavens and the earth.	In the beginning GOD renewed the heavens and the earth.
2. Seeing that the earth had been and was in existence an exceeding desolation: and darkness on the face of the deep; and the Spirit of GOD brooded on the face of the waters.	For the earth was in being, an exceeding desolation; and darkness *was* on the face of the deep: and the Spirit of GOD brooded on the face of the waters.
3. And GOD saith: There	And GOD saith: There

Literal Translation.

shall be light; and there is light.

4. And God beholds the light, that good; and God makes a division between the light and between the darkness.

5. And God calls to the light day; and to the darkness called He, night; and there is evening and there is morning, the first day.

6. And God saith: There shall be an expanse between the waters, and it shall be effectually separating between waters with respect to waters.

7. And God labours with reference to the expanse, and effectually separates between the waters, which under the expanse and between the waters which above the expanse: and it is so.

8. And God calls to the expanse, heavens: and there is evening and there is morning, a second day.

9. And God saith: The waters under the heavens shall be collected together into every several place: and the dry shall become apparent: and it is so.

Amended Translation.

shall be light: and there is light.

And God beholds the light that *it be* good: and God makes a division between the light and the darkness.

And God calls the light, day; and the darkness called He, night: and the evening and the morning *are* the first day.

And God saith: There shall be an expanse in the midst between the waters: and *it shall* effectually separate between waters and waters.

And God labours with reference to the expanse, and effectually separates between the waters, which *are* under the expanse and the waters, which *are* above the expanse: and it is so.

And God calls the expanse, heavens: and the evening and the morning *are* a second day.

And God saith: The waters under the heavens shall be gathered together into their several places; and the dry shall become apparent: and it is so.

Literal Translation.

10. And GOD calls to the dry, earth: and to collections of waters called He seas: and GOD beholds that good.

11. And GOD saith: The earth shall send forth young grass, the first blades of grass, the green herb seeding seed, the fruit-tree producing fruit after its kind, whose seed is in it, upon the earth; and it is so.

12. And the earth caused to come forth the young blades of grass, the green herb seeding seed after its kind: and the tree producing fruit, whose seed is in it, after its kind: and GOD beholds that good.

13. And there is evening and there is morning, a third day.

14. And GOD saith: There shall be places of light in the expanse of the heavens for to divide between the day and between the night; even as heretofore they have been for signs of seasons and for days and years.

15. Yea, they have heretofore existed for places of

Amended Translation.

And GOD calls the dry, earth; and the gathering together of the waters called He, seas: and GOD beholds that *it be* good.

And GOD saith: The earth shall send forth young grass, the tender herbage, the green herb seeding seed; the fruit-tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in it, upon the earth: and it is so.

And the earth sent forth the young blades of grass, the green herb seeding seed after its kind: and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in it, after its kind: and GOD beholds that *it be* good.

And the evening and the morning *are* a third day.

And GOD saith: The places of light shall continue to be in the expanse of the heavens to distinguish between the day and the night; even as heretofore they have been for signs of seasons and for days and years.

Yea, they have heretofore existed for places of light in

Literal Translation.

light in the expanse of the heavens; to give light upon the earth; and it shall be so.

16. And God continues to appoint the two places of light the great: the place of light the great for the rule of the day: and the place of light the small for the rule of the night; the stars also.

17. And God continues to place them in the expanse of the heavens for to cause light upon the earth;

18. And for to rule in the day and in the night: and for to divide between the light and between the darkness: and God beholds that good.

19. And there is evening and there is morning, a fourth day.

20. And God saith: The waters shall swarm with the creeper; the animal of life: and fowl shall fly above the earth, in the face of the expanse of the heavens.

21. And God fashions the sea monsters the great: and every animal the living the creeping; with which the waters swarmed according to their species; and every bird of wing according to its

Amended Translation.

the expanse of the heavens; to give light upon the earth; and it shall be so.

And God continues to appoint the two great places of light: the great place of light to rule the day, and the less place of light to rule the night: the stars also.

And God continues to place them in the expanse of the heavens to give light upon the earth;

And to rule in the day and in the night: and to divide between the light and the darkness: and God beholds that *it be* good.

And the evening and the morning *are* a fourth day.

And God saith: The waters shall swarm with the creeper, the living animal: and fowl shall fly above the earth, in the face of the expanse of the heavens.

And God fashions the huge sea monsters: and even every living animal that creepeth, with which the waters swarmed, according to their species; and moreover every bird of wing,

Literal Translation.

species; and GOD beholds that good.

22. And GOD blesses them to the extent of saying, Be fruitful; and multiply; and fill the waters in the seas; and the fowl shall multiply in the earth.

23. And there is evening and there is morning, a fifth day.

24. And GOD saith: The earth shall cause to go forth the animal of life according to its species; cattle and reptile and the wild beast of the land according to its species: and it is so.

25. And GOD designs the wild beast of the earth according to its species, and also the cattle, according to its species: and every thing creeping on the earth according to its species: and GOD beholds that good.

26. And GOD saith: We will make man in our Image, as it were in our likeness: and they shall have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over cattle, and over all the earth; and over every

Amended Translation.

according to its species: and GOD beholds that *it be* good.

And GOD blesses them even to saying, Be fruitful; and multiply; and fill abundantly the waters in the seas: and fowl also shall multiply in the earth.

And the evening and the morning *are* a fifth day.

And GOD saith: The earth shall bring forth the living animal, according to its species; cattle and reptile and wild beast of the earth, according to its species; and it is so.

And GOD fashions the wild beast of the earth according to its species; and moreover the cattle according to its species; and every thing that creepeth upon the ground according to its species: and GOD beholds that *it be* good.

And GOD saith: We will make man in our Image, as it were in our likeness: and they shall have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over cattle, and over all the earth; and over every creep-

Literal Translation.

creeping thing, the creeping on the earth.

27. And God creates the man in His Image, in the Image of God created He him: a male and a female created He them.

28. And God blesses them, and God saith unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and overflowingly fill ye the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing the creeping upon the earth.

29. And God saith: Behold I have given to you every herb seeding seed, which upon the face of the whole earth: and every tree, wherein the fruit of a tree seeding seed: to you it shall be for food.

30. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air and to every thing creeping on the earth, wherein the breath of life: even every green herb for food; and it shall be so.

31. And God beholds every thing which He has

Amended Translation.

ing thing that creepeth on the earth.

And God creates man in His Image; in the Image of God created He him: a male and a female created He them.

And God blesses them, and God saith to them, Be fruitful and multiply and entirely fill the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every thing living that creepeth on the earth.

And God saith: Behold I have given to you every herb seeding seed, which *is* upon the face of the whole earth; and every tree, wherein *is* the fruit of a tree seeding seed: to you it shall be for food.

And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth on the earth, wherein *is* the breath of life, even every green herb for food: and it shall be so.

And God beholds every thing, which He has made;

Literal Translation.	*Amended Translation.*
made; and behold good exceedingly: and there is evening and there is morning, a sixth day.	and behold *it is* good exceedingly: and the evening and the morning *are* the sixth day.

I am unable to present a revised version of the passage of Holy Writ under discussion in better form, than that given above. It is the production of a close attention, much thought, iterated erasures and small self-gratulation. I am free to confess it would be better done by an abler pen. Yet when done as well as skill and refinement can do it, shall you, reader, or shall I, be satisfied with it? I much doubt it. I have, however, shewn that fidelity is preferable to the charms of language and all the delights of literary excellence. It would be absolutely childish to prefer that, which is merely pleasing to the ear and the taste, to that, which should satisfy, and in satisfying should conciliate and command, the understanding and the judgment. In the specimen, I have in obedience to my own sense of justice and with some misgivings rendered, there are doubtless many things susceptible of improvement by a more finished touch; many things, which might be more naturally and so better expressed; many things which by a bold writer, might be altered and amended without prejudice to the intention of the original and the fidelity of the translation. On grounds of incorrectness I venture to say, there is no demand for a retouch; the translation is faithful and it is accurate. The attempt, nevertheless, is made more through the hope of exhibiting the necessity and practicability of a revision, than of meeting that necessity. And I consider that the

case is made out with only too much clearness. The measure is not only necessary, but indispensable. It demands immediate attention. The jaundiced complexion of the age we live in is the sad, but the only, plea for delay.[1]

In all that I have hitherto written I have referred to the Old Testament alone. Had I entered upon the shortcomings and the errors of the New Testament; had I essayed the proof of truths hidden, and false teaching cropping out of the translations of the Christian documents, where would be the end?[2] I will only say in this place and on this occasion, the good will of GOD to man is obscured behind errors of translation: errors against the simplest canons of human language; errors in the signification of words, of phrases, and of whole sentences; errors, suggested by prepossessions; errors, imposed by prejudice, by party zeal, by enthusiasm. But with these things I have no present concern; they are outside the field of the present undertaking.

[1] The reign of Victoria has been a distinguished one. But the achievement of a revised Bible would be a glory, before which all other glories would make obeisance. We are, however, in this age of morbid sentimentality and egregious folly, aye! and of the profoundest ignorance in high places, more likely to see the Book of Common Prayer, a book that was breathed and hallowed by Saints and Martyrs, assimilated to our Puritanical Bible, than to behold the Word of the Creator and Governor of the Universe done common justice to in our Anglican Version. And nevertheless we consider ourselves, and we are in many respects, the most enlightened people on the earth.

[2] The reader, who doubts this, has only to look into Burnet's History of the Reformation, and even that Puritanical writer will give him a melancholy insight into Puritanical outrages upon the written Word of GOD. He may witness the same process, illustrated by examples, in Macknight's General Preface to his New Translation of the Apostolical Epistles: and in Mill's Prolegomena to his Greek Testament, where Th. Beza is spoken of. He may see it *passim* by comparing the translation with the original; all protestations to the contrary notwithstanding.

JOSEPH MASTERS AND SON, PRINTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET.

19

3 2044 069 628 717